DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 851 HE 026 274

AUTHOR Calabia, Tino; And Others
TITLE Campus Tensions in Massachusetts: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 56p.; Report of a factfinding meeting (Amherst, MA, September 27, 1992).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Campuses; Civil Rights; College Administration; College Environment; College Faculty; Educational Environment; Higher Education; Law Enforcement; *Minority Groups; Racial Bias; *Racial Relations; School Policy; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Smith College MA; *University of Massachusetts Amherst

ABSTRACT

This publication reports on a factfinding meeting held to discuss bias-motivated tensions at college campuses in Massachusetts. At that meeting three State Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights were represented and heard testimony from student leaders, top administrators, concerned faculty members, and staff of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (UMASS/Amherst) and Smith College (Northampton, Massachusetts) as well as a panel of law enforcement professionals and legal experts. The report focuses primarily on presentations by 27 panelists with some presentations supplemented by media accounts and/or other documents related to the topic. The report is organized in six sections, the first of which notes the purpose of the meetings and offers an overview of the panels. The second section contains information from the testimony by individuals from UMASS/Amherst. A third section offers information from the testimony of representatives from Smith College. The fourth section presents the testimony of the public law enforcement and legal panel. Section 5 summarizes all the speakers' recommendations, and the final section distills the factfinding effort into 12 findings with specific recommendations for each. Appendixes contain information on 1990 college enrollment by race, a newspaper article, "How to Survive Campus Bigotry," by Paul Ruffins, and testimony offered by Fletcher A. Blanchard. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354851

Campus Tensions in Massachusetts: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties

Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE026274

October 1992

This factfinding report of the Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the participants in the factfinding meeting, other individuals or documents cited, or the Advisory Committee.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The United States Commission on Civil Rights

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, first created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and reestablished by the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the Federal Government. By the terms of the 1983 act, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

The State Advisory Committees

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and section 6(c) of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observeers, any open hearing or conference that the Commission may hold within the State.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE

Campus Tensions in Massachusetts: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties

Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

October 1992

This factfinding report of the Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the participants in the factfinding meeting, other individuals or documents cited, or the Advisory Committee.

Letter of Transmittal

Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Members of the Commission
Arthur A. Fletcher, *Chairperson*
Charles Pei Wang, *Vice Chairperson*
William B. Allen
Carl A. Anderson
Mary Frances Berry
Esther Gonzalez-Arroyo Buckley
Blandina Cardenas Ramirez
Russell G. Redenbaugh

Wilfredo J. Gonzalez, *Staff Director*

In September 1991 the Massachusetts Advisory Committee was joined by representatives of the Committees serving Connecticut and Vermont as they heard almost three dozen speakers discuss bias-related incidents and campus tensions in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England. In February 1992 the Vermont Advisory Committee held a similar factfinding meeting, as did the Connecticut Advisory Committee in April. Our report, unanimously approved by our Committee, focuses on Massachusetts and records the discussions of 29 speakers. They were in panels formed of students, administrators, faculty members, or staff from the University of Massachusetts (UMASS) at Amherst, the State's flagship campus, or Smith College, a private institution and one of the Nation's most prestigious women's colleges. Other speakers ranged from law enforcement officials to representatives of the Massachusetts Department of Education and the New England Board of Higher Education. We have supplemented their remarks with other materials, some of recent publication.

All speakers either agreed that overt bigotry, such as bias-motivated slurs or physical assault, occurs or assumed that it occurs. Two said that campus incidents have increased around the Nation, and a member of an international association of campus security officials characterized the increase as "gigantic." More locally, the UMASS public safety director declared that, "racism still flourishes on this campus," while a college junior stated, that in her whole life she had "never experienced as much racism as I have at Smith College." One speaker offered a profile of typical perpetrators, describing them as white males in their teens to mid-twenties, while another added that perpetrators—be they students or outsiders—often are both young and intoxicated at the time of the incident. Since incidents have been reported at Smith College, it could be that some females presumably commit them as well.

Of equal concern to the minority student panelists were acts of ignorance by classmates or others on campus who asked culturally naive questions or showed surprise when minority students excelled. Two charged abuse by local police. Most student speakers were also troubled by tardy responses or no response from administrators to grievances voiced by the students. Several said that the competition for funds to support different cultural centers sometimes involved campus administrators pitting one minority group against another. The students called for increased recruitment of minority students and faculty, more financial aid, and reform of the core curriculum. A Jewish student charged that Jews were precluded from involvement in a

major event on minority concerns, while a Jewish professor at UMASS reported that Jews have been assaulted by skinheads and also victimized by "black and brown racism" on campus.

Administrators generally acknowledged that prejudice persists but also pointed to efforts made to remedy problems including the establishment of cultural centers and student-faculty committees, changes in curriculum, and recruitment goals to increase the presence of minorities on campus. Despite occasional notes of pessimism about whether bigotry can be fully eradicated, the administrators, faculty, and students proposed various remedies, as has the Massachusetts Advisory Committee. We trust that you will favorably consider all such recommendations including one by our Committee which urges you to follow up on your October 1990 report and direct your attention to this national problem again by mid-decade.

Sincerely,

Dorothy S. Jones

Dorothy S. Jones, *Chairperson*
Massachusetts Advisory Committee

Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Dorothy S. Jones, *Chairperson*
Somerville

Richard S. Aldrich
Fall River

Deirdre A. Almeida*
Amherst

Donald M. Bloch
Framingham

Matthew A. Budd
Cambridge

Edward L. Cooper
Roxbury

Cecile Marie Esteves
Holyoke

Dale C. Jenkins, Jr.
Everett

Reginald L. Johnson
Cambridge

Elizabeth L. Price
Worcester

M. Paula Raposa
Somerset

Gladys Rodriguez
Worcester

Jahnvibol D. Tip
Lowell

---

*Acting Chairperson who moderated the factfinding meeting.

Acknowledgments

The Massachusetts Advisory Committee wishes to thank the staff of the Commission's Eastern Regional Office for its help in the preparation of this report. The factfinding meeting and summary report were the principal assignments of Tino Calabia with support from Michèle D. Morgan, and Linda Raufu. Editorial assistance and preparation of the report for publication was provided by Gloria Hong Izumi. The project was carried out under the overall supervision of John I. Binkley, Director, Eastern Regional Office.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
- Purpose of Committee Project 2
- Overview Panel 2
  - Massachusetts Department of Education 2
  - Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 3
  - Int'l. Assoc. of Campus Law Enforcement Administrato 5
  - New England Board of Higher Education 6

2. University of Massachusetts at Amherst 8
- Office of Provost 8
- UMASS Student Panel 9
  - Black Mass Communications Project 9
  - Cape Verdean Student Alliance 11
  - United Asian Cultural Center 11
  - Hillel House 12
  - Jeffrey L. Pegram 14
- UMASS Panel of Administrators 14
  - Office of Human Relations 14
  - Office of the Dean of Students 15
  - UMASS Public Safety Department 17
- UMASS Faculty Panel 18
  - Afro-American Studies Department 18
  - Legal Studies Department 18
  - Spanish and Portuguese Department 19
  - English Department 20
  - Plant and Soil Sciences Department 21

3. Smith College 22
- Smith College Student Panel 22
  - Indigenous Americans of Smith College 22
  - Hillel of Smith College 23
  - Asian Students Association of Smith College 23
  - Nosotras 24
  - Student Worker in Admissions 25
  - Black Students Alliance 25
- Smith College Administrator/Faculty Panel 26
  - Office of the College President 26
  - Psychology Department 29
  - Smith College Campus Security Department 31

4. Public Law Enforcement and Legal Panel 32
Massachusetts State Police 32
District Attorney's Office for Northwestern District 32
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law 33

5. Summary and Recommendations of Speakers 35

6. Findings and Recommendations 38

Appendices 41
A. 1990 College Enrollment by Race 41
B. "How to Survive Campus Bigotry" 42
C. Testimony Offered by Fletcher A. Blanchard 44

1. Introduction

In 1991 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights outlined a multiyear plan to review the status of bias-motivated tensions around the United States. As the national Commission identified six urban areas—from Washington, D.C. to Los Angeles—in which to hold hearings, three of the Commission's State Advisory Committees in New England decided to examine the causes of similar tensions affecting large and small college campuses in their respective States. After publishing *Bigotry and Violence on American College Campuses* in October 1990, the Commission had encouraged its Advisory Committees to consider followup projects in their States.[1]

In response, the Massachusetts Advisory Committee invited delegations from the University of Massachusetts (UMASS) at Amherst and Smith College to discuss the issue on September 27, 1991; the Vermont Advisory Committee invited delegations from the University of Vermont at Burlington and Middlebury College for similar talks on February 10, 1992; and the Connecticut Advisory Committee invited delegations from the University of Connecticut at Storrs and Wesleyan University for the final factfinding meeting on April 27, 1992. (Appendix A provides enrollment statistics by race for each school.)

Though the sample of higher educational institutions was limited to six, each Advisory Committee had selected two schools: the flagship of its State university system plus a small selective college with a student body of residents from States throughout the Nation. In a day-long examination of the topic, students, administrators, professors, and other staff where asked whether or not their institutions experienced bias-motivated problems, and, if so, what the causes were, how problems were manifested, what measures were taken to combat them, what experiences offered possible solutions for reducing or eventually eliminating campus tensions, and what recommendations they might offer.

At the kickoff factfinding meeting in Massachusetts, all three State Advisory Committees were represented. Besides hearing from student leaders, top administrators, concerned faculty members, and staff of UMASS/Amherst and Smith College, members from the three Committees benefited by listening to a top legal officer of the Massachusetts Department of Education who sketched what many students experience before graduating from high school, an attorney and national conference coordinator who described harassment occurring around the United States, and a board director of a national association of campus security officials who shared his perspective.

For the late afternoon session, the Region I Director and staff of the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education had organized and led a special roundtable discussion. It involved a Region I representative of the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, a project staff member of the New England Board of Higher Education, the executive director for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law of the Boston Bar Association, and other experts and concerned parties. Some months later, supplementing the panels of undergraduate students, administrators, faculty, and staff of the four schools appearing during the factfinding meetings in the other two States were the chief executive officer of a State human relations commission, local law enforcement administrators, and teaching personnel from a school of social work and a medical school—all of whom added to the wealth of data upon which the three Advisory Committees could draw for their reports.

This report focuses primarily on presentations by the 27 panelists who appeared during the two earlier sessions at the University of Massachusetts and by 2 who participated in the final session there. Some presentations are supplemented by media accounts and/or other documents related to the topic, two published as recently as August

1 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Bigotry and Violence on American College Campuses*, October 1990.

1992. Because other late afternoon participants were affiliated with other colleges or agencies beyond Massachusetts, their contributions will be reflected in the two Advisory Committee reports on campus tensions elsewhere in New England.

Purpose of Committee Project

Deirdre A. Almeida, the Acting Chairperson of the Massachusetts Advisory Committee, moderated the factfinding meeting hosted by UMASS on its main campus in Amherst. She observed that the factfinding meeting was taking place almost 5 years to the date of the outbreak of racial violence triggered after the Boston Red Sox lost to the New York Mets in the final game of the 1986 World Series,[2] and added that some measure of success had reportedly been achieved in trying to lessen antagonisms among racial and religious groups.

But Almeida also pointed out that less than 2 weeks prior to the factfinding meeting, the *Boston Globe* reported that "nearly a third of all [Massachusetts students] recently surveyed have experienced racial, ethnic, or gender offenses."[3] While the Advisory Committee members from the three States expected to learn about any such problems affecting the schools, Almeida emphasized their hope that they would also learn about "current programs intended to combat campus intolerance, as all of us search for solutions in the nineties."

Overview Panel

Massachusetts Department of Education

Representing the Massachusetts Department of Education, Acting General Counsel Sandra L. Moody said that it is not easy to explain why some elementary and secondary school students harbor misconceptions about members of other races and religions while their classmates may show a sense of respect for diversity. One answer, she suggested, is that:

> some students have more respect for others simply because they have had more experience and have encountered teachers who are more open to issues of diversity, and I think that is the key to the whole problem, especially on the elementary and secondary level, which in turn leads into the college level.

Thus, education is critical to remedying the situation, and she emphasized her department's commitment to help all students learn about the basic similarities among people and the importance of showing respect for the differences among them.

Over the last 15 to 20 years, her department has engaged in various curriculum initiatives. One involved the World of Difference curriculum set up by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in which teachers received indepth training in developing curricula on racial and cultural differences; the program also showed teachers how their own behavior may have been affected by their personal cultural biases and what could be done to modify any such behavior. Teachers learned ways of getting students to become better aware of what other people feel and how to deal with differences among people. Another initiative involved a joint project with the Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts. Entitled the Bill of Rights Education Project, it incorporated a number of seminars for students as well as teachers at the elementary and secondary school levels. The aim was to make them aware of the constitutional protections available to them and to others.

The State board of education has also given grants to teachers to develop curricula around diversity and the needs of a multicultural student population. Conflicts and fights among students in middle and high schools—which may not all have started as bias-motivated but which "escalated into racial confrontations"—gave rise to curriculum efforts to prevent violence. A recent such out-

---

2 See, for example, Matthew L. Wald, "Racism Blamed for Brawl at U. of Massachusetts," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1987. The article deals with the 52-page, undated "Report on University of Massachusetts Investigation," authored by Frederick A. Hurst, then a member of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. Almeida's statement and most other statements in this report are from the official transcript of the Sept. 27, 1991, transcript. A few statements and other information are from sources cited in the text and/or in the appropriate footnotes.

3 Charles A. Radin, "Despite 'PC' Trend, Offenses Continue," *Boston Globe*, Sept. 15, 1991, p. B-36 (hereafter cited as ". . . Offenses Continue"). UMASS/Amherst students were among the 569 students interviewed for the *Boston Globe* poll.

break of incidents occurred at Randolph High School which involved "a variety of explanations." But in any case, Moody stressed, the problem then becomes:

> how do you stop these things from happening again? . . . The real effort is not to go in when these incidents occur but to . . . try to prevent these things from happening in the future, to try to encourage student awareness of each other and teacher awareness of cultural, racial, ethnic, and religious differences among students . . . in the hopes that we can by the time these students reach the college campus, we have essentially tried to nip [the problem] in the bud. . . .

However, because of economic conditions affecting the Commonwealth and the local school districts, such efforts have been severely cut since staff development budgets "are usually the first to be cut, or among the first to be cut," when resources become scarce. Moody closed by saying that "though facing very, very tough times ahead," she hoped that the department could resume the efforts of the past "because now they are needed more than ever."

How much more might be indicated by a November 1990 issue of *Education Week* which reported on a nationwide opinion survey by Louis Harris and Associates. The survey revealed that, "a majority of high school students have witnessed or heard about racial incidents with violent overtones, and nearly half would either join in or approve the action. . . ." Asked what they would do if they found their friends "stirring up trouble over some racial or religious group," 30 percent replied that they might possibly join in, while "17 percent said they might agree with the action and that the victimized group 'deserves what it gets.'"[4]

Troubling in a somewhat different vein was a *Washington Post* article on race relations appearing earlier in the same month as the Massachusetts Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting. The writer noted the importance of discussing matters of racial differences even with preschoolers. Given the dominance of white society in America, black children, for example, can develop harmfully poor self-images. For this reason, "Parents should teach their children about race at an early age . . . because usually around age 3 children begin showing a preference for whites."[5]

More recently, a national survey by Peter D. Hart Research Associates was described in an April 1992 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education;* this survey found that, "a plurality of white youths now in college or who have completed college and two-thirds of their black counterparts say race relations are 'generally bad.'"[6]

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Attorney Sally J. Greenberg, of the Boston office of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith,[7] said that most of her attention is focused on New England, but that in 1989 she had coordinated a national conference on campus tensions for the ADL. She also noted that the ADL was established in 1913 and has been committed to fighting anti-Semitism and injustice and advocating fair treatment for all people. "We are not just concerned with incidents directed against Jews. We can't be, because they are all interrelated."

With regard to anti-Semitism, since 1978, ADL has compiled a list of incidents—swastika graffiti, broken windows, anti-Semitic notes under the door—that have occurred across the Nation. Greenberg explained that the incidents include vandalism against Jewish homes, businesses, and institutions such as synagogues and Hillel buildings on college campuses. Verbal or written harassment is also recorded, such as the several hundred phone calls which one Northeastern University student made over a 3-month period to a nearby realtor and to campus gay and lesbian groups. The perpetrator was apprehended and prosecuted by the U.S. attorney in Boston for the

4 Millicent Lawton, "High School Students Say Racial Incidents Common," *Education Week*, Nov. 28, 1990, p. 6.

5 Yvonne Shinhoster Lamb, "Race Relations & Preschoolers: It's Never Too Early to Begin Building Self-Esteem," *Washington Post*, Sept. 9, 1991.

6 Arthur J. Kropp, president, People for the American Way, "Colleges Must Find Ways to Eradicate Racial Divisions," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Apr. 22, 1992, p. B-3.

7 See Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, *ADL Conference on Campus Prejudice*, 1990 (hereafter cited as *ADL Conference on Campus Prejudice*).

Federal violation of using the mail and phones to threaten the Realtor and the gay and lesbian groups. Sentenced just 2 weeks before the factfinding meeting, the perpetrator was expected to serve about a year in prison.

Greenberg said that the first six campus incidents were reported in 1984, doubling to 12 in 1985 and increasing to 16 in 1986. A reduction to 14 occurred in 1987, and that drop and other occasional reductions indicate that the overall growth in the annual count may not just be due to an increase in reporting, as some have suggested. In any case, the number rose to 33 in 1990, and with only incomplete counts from some of ADL's 30 offices, 17 incidents had been tallied for 1991 up to the month of the factfinding meeting. As to the total number including noncampus incidents across the Nation, there were 1,686 reported in 1991, an 18 percent increase over 1990 and an increase for the fourth successive year.[8]

She pointed out that the 95 campus-related incidents in 1990 represented a substantial increase over the 69 that had been reported in 1989; because the 1990 incidents were reported by only 57 campuses, there were double or triple incidents at some schools. In her opinion, one of the most egregious took place at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota. Three self-described skinheads who were not students at the college entered the kosher kitchen of a dormitory and left anti-Semitic graffiti and a kosher cooking utensil filled with their excrement. After their arrest, the three pleaded guilty, and were sentenced. At the University of Wisconsin in 1990, a wave of anti-Semitic episodes erupted after a series of attacks had taken place against individuals in the city of Madison, where 20 incidents were reported in July.

Also in 1990, but more local to New England, at a State college in Vermont, a Jewish dean of students was continuously harassed by phone, mail, and fliers. At a private college in New Hampshire, again in 1990, an edition of an independent student newspaper appeared with a highly offensive quotation from Adolf Hitler. The quotation appeared on the newspaper's masthead on the holiest of Jewish holidays, Yom Kippur. According to another local newspaper, the student newspaper had invited the ADL and the college to join it in investigating the incident. During ADL's investigation, the students at the paper denied any responsibility for the incident, reported Greenberg.

She said that at UMASS/Amherst itself, early in the 1991 fall semester, a flier was circulated about the Professor Leonard Jeffries case at the City College of New York;[9] the flier proclaimed that "Third World Affairs and the black community will hold Hillel and the Jewish people" responsible for any harm that might befall Jeffries. Greenberg stressed that she believed Third World Affairs and the blacks on campus who declared that they had no knowledge of who circulated the flier, but the incident heightened the kind of tensions felt by the Jewish students at UMASS, nonetheless.

Asked who were the perpetrators of the kind of incidents which she described, Greenberg replied that they "are generally white males between the ages of 16 and 24. . . . Of course, in the vast majority of cases, there are no perpetrators ever found." Greenberg further noted that she has observed so-called skinheads processed by the courts and has had the opportunity to ask some whether they knew any blacks or Jews and what motivates them. She reported that, "Shockingly they say, 'No.' But then they know they hate us. That's one thing they know. They don't know why."

Speaking more generally, Greenberg remarked that, "Part of the problem is that people don't talk to each other. People don't have the opportunities to really try to get to know who each other are. . . . A lot of these incidents are caused by ignorance, really a lack of understanding about one another's cultures." Consequently, she endorsed the idea that students should be required to take courses explaining different cultures, a mission that colleges are uniquely suited to accomplish.

On the other hand, Greenberg also remembered that after the 1986 World Series games incident, she and others who proposed responses to the situation recommended getting people together to

8 In March 1991 a senior writer for *Black Issues in Higher Education* reported that, "statistics reveal that one of every four students of color on white campuses cannot get through an academic year without experiencing some racially-motivated incident." Joye Mercer, *Black Issues in Higher Education*, Mar. 14, 1991, p. 2.

9 See, for example, John Tierney, "For Jeffries a Penchant for Disputes," *New York Times*, Sept. 7, 1991, p. A-28.

talk, establishing hotlines, organizing joint student projects, and the like.[10] She also stressed that on the issue of black and Jewish conflicts discussion must extend beyond just talks. "I have participated in so many black/Jewish dialogues. Dialogues alone are not particularly productive."

Instead, she encouraged the development of a joint agenda, perhaps a project that both groups would become committed to. "You can't just come together to talk about conflicts." She said that any such joint enterprise would apply to other racial or religious groups trying to overcome differences as well. In closing, Greenberg recommended an ADL booklet containing suggestions for resolving campus tensions problems. Whereas Moody had earlier referred to ADL's World of Difference Program, Greenberg mentioned that ADL now has a Campus of Difference Program which was to be used in Vermont as followup to the Vermont campus incident she had mentioned. Regarding how parents can work with their own children, in 1989 ADL published "What to Tell Your Child About Prejudice and Discrimination."[11]

Int'l. Assoc. of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators

Raymond C. McKearney, the region I director of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) and also the director of public safety at the University of Massachusetts in Dartmouth, Massachusetts, agreed with Greenberg that there has been a significant increase in campus tensions incidents. Having consulted his counterparts on the west coast, he described the increase as "gigantic." Nevertheless, on his own campus there have been fewer tensions incidents, but they are more violent. Like Moody, McKearney believed that education is the key – not just for training students in junior high and high school in how to be more tolerant, but also police officers. "We have got to train [the police] that serve us. We have got to teach them to be more sensitive and how to interact with different cultures rather than treating everybody the same across the board."

He said that his own campus has begun organizing a cultural diversity week each year to educate the university population, including his own public safety department. Moreover, he stated that:

> we have to spend a lot more time teaching police officers to be tolerant of different situations. We all saw the incident that happened in Los Angeles with the Los Angeles Police Department. . . . I think we better take a good long look at how we train the police. They have got to learn to be more tolerant than what I think we have now trained them to be in . . . Massachusetts.

Like Moody, he decried the fact that the economic problems affecting the Commonwealth have unfortunately led to a slackening in the effort to educate people to become more tolerant. "Less Federal money means less local and State money," stated McKearney. And, though new students enter college each year, "we don't follow up and train them. That's where we are dropping the ball."

On the drop in Federal support for higher education and the drop in State support, an August 1992, *New York Times* article noted that, according to a spokesperson for the American Council of Education, the Federal cuts in many domestic programs during the 1980s forced the States to divert their discretionary higher education funds "to mandated responsibilities in areas like highways, transportation, prisons, medicaid, and even primary and secondary schools. . . ." The article further pointed out that ". . . a record number of students are enrolled in colleges and universities across the country . . . ," and that the increase in the number of 18-year-old freshman is expected to continue.[12]

---

10 In December 1986 Greenberg proposed several recommendations to then-Commissioner Frederick A. Hurst of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, who had been invited by the UMASS chancellor to investigate the World Series games incident. Leonard Zakim, executive director, and Sally Greenberg, civil rights director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, letter to Hurst, Dec. 15, 1986.

11 "What to Tell Your Child About Prejudice and Discrimination," Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1989.

12 Karen DeWitt, "Colleges Seeing More Students but Less Money," *New York Times*, Aug. 5, 1992, p. B-8.

New England Board of Higher Education

Emorcia V. Hill, assistant director of the Equity and Pluralism Action Program of the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), described her program as a regionwide effort aimed at increasing the number of black, Hispanic, and Native American students and faculty at New England's institutions of higher education. It was developed as a result of a special 1989 NEBHE report, *Equity and Pluralism,* that had documented that racial minorities were significantly underrepresented on New England campuses and that racist behavior was widespread.

Hill stated that Equity and Pluralism generally aims at increasing the number of minorities on campuses. The underlying rationale for the project is that prejudices, myths, and misunderstandings can be overcome as people from different races and cultures coexist and become increasingly familiar with one another. At the outset, blacks and Hispanics were the primary target groups. But 2 years after the project began it was expanded to include Native Americans and some Asian American groups. Besides students, the project directly involves the trustees and presidents of the institutions, and the affirmative action and multicultural affairs personnel in various capacities.

Another effort attempts to establish a student support network so as to render New England more hospitable and welcoming to minority students. When Hill considers that there are only two NEBHE staff carrying out these efforts among the 260 institutions throughout New England—so many with different levels of awareness and willingness to address diversity issues—she sometimes looks upon it as an "overly ambitious and at times an almost impossible task."

On the other hand, one of the "most pleasurable projects" for Hill is a major program component aimed at making New England more hospitable to minority students. Called the New England Role Model Network, it brings together approximately 350 students from high schools through graduate and professional schools who meet at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for one day each fall.

> We try to build a role model network, an educational pipeline, a mentor pipeline. . . . Today we are calling [the project] our Mutual Aide Society because it is essentially a way of students coming together and sharing strategies about how you survive and succeed on New England's predominantly white campuses.

The project also links students with "distinguished faculty role models who are black, Hispanic, and Native Americans. . . ." On that day "there is a lot of energy created," and students who often are not aware of good role models find successful minority faculty role models readily available to them. The students ask:

> "How did you do it? What courses did you take? How did you survive emotionally? Who mentored you? Who supported you? How did you deal with your family?" It's basically a very, very informal setting, but what it does for the student is that it restores hope and gives them a sense of perspective.

Although the day-long event features several panel discussions and workshops, it is basically an informal setting. High school students can see undergraduate students who are surviving and achieving; undergraduates can see graduate students, who are similarly situated. Hill reported that one black female community college student who aspired to become a physician told Hill that until that day she had never seen a black female doctor. In like manner, for Native American students Hill said that she "struggle[s] very hard to find good faculty role models who are Native American. The reality is that they are out there." After such network events, NEBHE encourages each State to replicate the event at its own level. Schools in Vermont have done so, said Hill, and in Maine, "where poor indigenous whites are considered underrepresented in their educational system, they are also included in the network."

Another aspect of Equity and Pluralism focuses on recruitment of new faculty. Hill said that educational institutions have claimed, "We can't find good minorities," when asked why they may have only one minority faculty member or only one Hispanic in the Spanish department. To answer the need NEBHE, at the time of the factfinding meeting, was developing a "directory that lists almost 400 doctoral students coming up through the pipeline. . . . We have minority students pursuing medical degrees, joint M.D./Ph.D degrees, [students] who are in biochemistry, the humanities, and the social sciences." Upon completion, the directory will be shared with the presidents or aca-

demic vice presidents at institutions of higher education.

Hill also spoke of the "depth and degree of isolation that students feel," telling her, "'I'm the first in the department. I'm the only one. I thought there was going to be more of us; they brought me here under a false pretext." To encourage institutions to help reduce or eliminate such feelings of isolation among minority students, Hill appeals to the self-interest of the institutions, telling them that to survive through the nineties, they will have to work to accommodate more minorities and women. She also believed that some institutions are making strides such as the University of Massachusetts which:

> is far ahead of the pack in that it has embraced a multicultural curriculum. . . . [UMASS] is one of the few campuses beginning to take the issue very seriously and dealing with it in terms of curriculum, which is very unusual. Brown University has the Brown Blueprint, a student-driven diversity plan. Smith College has its own mandate. More and more institutions are beginning to embrace the whole diversity issue.

Noting that NEBHE has counterparts in other regions of the Nation, Hill pointed out that the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) issued a 1990 study called *Racial Issues on Campus: How Students View Them.* According to the SREB, the issue in the South was more of a majority-minority dichotomy; wherever there is such a relationship, the "minority always feel isolated and alone and oppressed, regardless of race."[13] Thus, in the South, white students on predominantly black campuses experienced problems similar to problems encountered by black students on predominantly white campuses.

In contrast, NEBHE found that the problem in New England was more of a white-minority issue, and racism is a problem, according to Hill. Thus, NEBHE has been attempting to introduce more blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans onto New England campuses in the ways that she had described.

---

13 Ansley A. Abraham, *Racial Issues on Campus: How Students View Them,* Southern Regional Education Board (Atlanta), 1990, p. 13. Analyzing data from over 4,583 respondents, the author writes, ". . . a student's race is often not the major factor in determining his or her opinion or perception about campus climate. Instead, it seems that these opinions or perceptions are determined more by the student's membership in the minority or majority group on campus and, to a lesser extent, by the type of institution they attend."

2. University of Massachusetts at Amherst

> The university does not really understand us, and it does not understand itself. If you want to be multicultural, don't look at me, look at yourself first. If you want better relations on campus, look at white racism and why relations are so poor.
>
> Alexander Nguyen, Student
> University of Massachusetts

> [Students] are literally unprepared in many ways for the kind of cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity [UMASS] offers, and they have had no preparation in high school. They have had health education, physical education, and driver's education universally, but not multicultural education. As a consequence, we as an institution are placed in the position of having to do remedial multicultural education for huge numbers of students every year. . . .
>
> Grant Ingle, Director
> UMASS Office of Human Relations

Office of Provost

After being introduced by Almeida, Acting Provost Glen Gordon welcomed the Advisory Committee representatives and their staff as well as the other factfinding meeting participants. He acknowledged that UMASS/Amherst has "had our share of . . . racial and religious conflict" and that efforts to address the problem began in earnest in the sixties among the residential colleges. Ten years prior to the factfinding meeting, the Chancellor's Commission on Civility in Human Relations was organized as a group of faculty, students, and staff meant to advise the UMASS administrators on issues of bias. Soon afterwards three civility commission recommendations were implemented involving: the development of a general education curriculum requiring all students to take two social and cultural diversity courses; increasing the amount of co-curricular programs for faculty, students, and staff on issues of race, religion, gender, and sexual orientation; and opening an office of human relations to maintain discussions and encourage institutional changes.

But those and later efforts did not put an end to racial and religious conflicts . . . . They have, however, changed the way we think about these issues and how we respond to them. They have also convinced us of the continuing need to explore these issues openly and frankly.

Thus, UMASS welcomed the opportunity to host the factfinding meeting, Gordon concluded.

Adding helpful details to the provost's summary is a 1988 *Washington Post* national survey of campus tensions which focused primarily on UMASS/Amherst and a February 1988 takeover of the New Africa House at UMASS. The article cited a participant in a similar takeover 18 years earlier, who observed that the students involved in 1988 "worked out their demands with a belief that the system would work for them" in contrast to how protesting students felt in 1970. The reporter also interviewed two protest leaders, a black male who said, "Racism is a serious problem here, but we are far ahead of other schools," and a Puerto Rican female, who suggested that, "the university has made a good start and that the campus is alive with opportunities for minorities students."[1] As shall be seen below, students and others at the factfinding meeting voiced differing opinions on the current situation.

---

1 Michael Rezendes, "Campus Minorities: Confronting Racism With Mature Methods," *Washington Post*, Apr. 19, 1988, p. A-3.

UMASS Student Panel

Black Mass Communications Project

James Arthur Jemison represented the Black Mass Communications Project, which he described as one of the largest organizations on campus. He stated that when a black or other minority student graduates from UMASS/Amherst or a similar State or private school elsewhere, that student has earned two degrees one for rigorous academic work, the second for having survived "a lot of negative hatred on the part of faculty, staff, and other students." The racism is systemic and sometimes overt with blacks and other minority students subjected to slurs while walking down the street or as targets of racist notes.

On the other hand, Jemison acknowledged that:

> oftentimes people who are perpetrating [bias-motivated incidents] and acting out are not acting out of knowledge. They are acting out of ignorance. Maybe there is a student or a professor who has really low expectations of your performance, which can often be as equally destructive as some of the overt forms.

For example, a teacher might say, "This is really good work; I have not seen a black student perform this way before."

Jemison noted that more subtle things can happen, too. "You might wonder why you do not get financial aid, or why you cannot seem to make enough money to come back to the university." He then also referred to "certain conditions . . . in the way that Massachusetts is set up." Having recently visited a friend in a predominantly black neighborhood in Boston, he crossed the railroad tracks and found himself in a white neighborhood. Though not as it was in the past, urban segregation obviously persists, said Jemison, adding that white students who come to college from suburban communities may also lack experience interacting with blacks and other minorities just as black students coming from black neighborhoods may lack experience dealing with whites. Thus, conditions in the broader society must be addressed along with the conditions that exist at UMASS and other colleges.

In terms of urban demographics, a July 1991 *Washington Post* article analyzed Census Bureau figures and showed that of the major cities in the northeast only Boston and New York City showed appreciable increases in the influx of blacks.[2] The latter gained by 16.4 percent between 1980 and 1990, but Boston's black population gained by 35.6 percent over the same period. Regarding school segregation, in January 1992 the *New York Times* reported on a study released by the National School Boards Association which indicated that, "it is in the North's urban centers and suburbs and in the West that minority youngsters find themselves increasingly in separate and unequal schools." Even where minorities were moving into the suburbs, a pattern of segregated schools has often repeated itself.[3] Shortly afterwards, a front page article in the March 1992 *Forum,* a publication of the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, asserted that:

> Most children in America still grow up in communities that are segregated by race and socioeconomic status; they still attend segregated schools, places of worship, and youth programs. The average American child has very little direct contact with people who are different. . . Meaningful efforts at multicultural education are an exception in most schools. Even when multicultural curriculum materials are available, often they are given low priority or presented by untrained, sometimes resentful teachers.[4]

During the factfinding meeting, Jemison also noted that the fear among college students is also a result of the hostile climate resulting from economic conditions. "In America, unfortunately many working-class people are competing against one another for the same jobs, the same money." The byproduct of animosity, race-baiting, and fear occurring around the Nation:

> is pervasive and makes things a lot worse between the races on campus. . . . There is a great fear among many students

2 Barbara Vobejda and D'Vera Cohn, "Blacks Left Northern States for Boom Areas in '80s," *Washington Post,* July 5, 1991, p. A-1.

3 Karen DeWitt, "The Nation's Schools Learn a Fourth R: Re-segregation," *New York Times,* Jan. 19, 1992. See also Mary Jordan, "Big-City Schools Became More Segregated During 1980s, Study Says," *Washington Post,* Jan. 9, 1992.

4 National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence, *Forum,* March 1992, p. 1 and p. 9.

that I am going to take somebody's job or [factfinding meeting student panelist] Malkes Gomes is going to take somebody's job.

Meanwhile, colleges have introduced the multiculturalism concept. Jemison viewed it as a sound idea, but the manner in which it is being introduced at UMASS/Amherst and other colleges "is indicative of the kind of feeble support that it has been given." He said, for example, that Civility Week gave recognition to multiculturalism. He believed that it was begun in reaction to the 1986 World Series incidents; however, in 1989 it involved "an awful lot of advertising, an awful lot of discussion, and an awful lot of talk, but very little action." He judged it of questionable value, and it was not repeated in 1990 or 1991. Jemison's opinion seemed a milder echo of one voiced in a front-page *Washington Post* article in 1990. In that article, the then-student government president at UMASS, a black female, was quoted as saying, "We've had the Hurst report, multicultural reports, civility weeks—it's all a bunch of bull."[5]

Jemison explained that he has been a resident assistant on campus for 2 years holding "a very, very good position." Other black resident assistants and he belong to a caucus, and recently some discussed an incident affecting one of them. After being attacked by a white student, a black resident assistant was blamed by the resident director for the incident, despite the fact that witnesses confirmed that the assistant had been "minding his own business" when the white student "jumped across the table and attacked him."

He also reported that he has entered buildings where the elevators were filled with giant swastikas aimed at Jewish students, black students, and gay students, graffiti "undiscussed and uncommented on in the news." He has also witnessed harassment by police officers of his black friends who were driving under the speed limit in legally registered cars and "being stopped for no reason at all." Such incidents have been recorded at the department of public safety where they can be verified, said Jemison. In a March 1992 issue of the monthly magazine, *USA Today,* a specialist in campus bigotry wrote that:

> In many universities, male minority students complain that campus police officials are more likely to stop and question them than they do whites or women. Sometimes, campus police use racial slurs, and false detention cases (e.g., presuming the African American student in an interracial brawl is the culprit) have resulted in lawsuits.[6]

Jemison mentioned that in one class in his major area of study, he was the only black student.

> Needless to say, whenever an issue about a black person came up, the teacher would ask a question, and peoples' heads would turn to me in expectation of an answer. I'm . . . willing to educate people occasionally, but that is not something I should be forced to do in a classroom setting. . . . Or, if you say something incorrect in class, it is sort of assumed that you are the representative of an inferior people, and that's a feeling I don't think many other students can confess to, having to testify for the entire race.

To change the climate at UMASS/Amherst, Jemison recommended that more minority students and faculty be recruited, with the students given more support and financial aid—not just taking them in, giving them some financial aid, and then forcing them to have to come up with the rest of the money themselves. Instead of "spending so much money on civility weeks which are great intellectually," he urged spending it on going into African American and Latino neighborhoods to recruit students and then providing sufficient financial aid to help those students stay in school.

At the start of 1989 the New England Board of Higher Education also recommended more financial aid for low-income black and Hispanic students. Its recommendation was based on a finding that:

> Inadequate financial aid is a barrier for low-income students in many areas of the region and accounts in large part for the disappointing rate of participation of blacks

---

5 David Maraniss, "University Tries to Mend Racial Divisions; Antagonism Persists in Amherst, Where Brawl Led to 'Civility Week,'" *Washington Post,* Mar. 7, 1990, p. 1.

6 Kenneth S. Stern, "Battling Bigotry on Campus," *USA Today: the Magazine of the American Scene,* March 1992, p. 62 (hereafter cited as "Battling Bigotry on Campus").

and Hispanics in New England undergraduate and graduate study.[7]

Because of Federal cuts in student aid since 1980, "the Boston and Amherst campuses of the University of Massachusetts, for example, have experienced great difficulty in recruiting minority students at both locations," wrote the board.[8]

Cape Verdean Student Alliance

Malkes Gomes represented the Cape Verdean Student Alliance which he said is composed of students whose ancestors began coming from Cape Verde, a country off the coast of western Africa, since its whaling ships sailed off the American coast 150 years ago. Few know who the Cape Verdeans are, even though there are as many as 350,000 in New England and, 4 or 5 years prior to the factfinding meeting, there had been at least 150 Cape Verdean students at UMASS/Amherst.

Gomes regretted that there were currently only 40 Cape Verde students on campus and 3 faculty or staff. He explained that cuts in financial support and other resources have resulted in fewer Cape Verdean applicants and in dropouts among those who do enroll. He also pointed out that Cape Verdeans are descended from a mixture of Portuguese and Africans and so exhibit a range of skin colors. For some, however, this has meant that "we are not too black, for other people, we are too white" and have been brainwashed by Europeans.

Like Jemison, Gomes had served as a resident assistant. Before assuming their duties, resident assistants must take a class in social diversity. Gomes suggested that all freshmen should have to take the course. Like Jemison, he reported incidents of students being stopped by the police due to their color, in this instance Cape Verdean students. The previous year, he had been stopped at 1:00 in the morning while driving with a friend. As Gomes spoke in Creole to his friend, the police pointedly told him to speak English.

On another occasion, Gomes was walking and carrying a bag somewhat larger than a backpack, and two police cars with lights flashing stopped in front of him and a police van in back of him. Gomes asked the officers why they stopped him, and they explained that a house had been burglarized in Amherst and a computer was stolen. Gomes wondered how a computer would have fit in his bag and why the police were around campus and stopped him. His own answer was that the general attitude of the police and people on campus is, "What are you doing here? You don't belong."

United Asian Cultural Center

Representing the United Asian Cultural Center, Alexander Nguyen began by trying to dispel the myth that Asian Americans are "the model minority" and arguing that the myth ultimately hurts the many Asians who are not so successful in school. He estimated, for example, that the school dropout rate for southeast Asian students is over 50 percent. He added that the myth is also used against blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans by suggesting that "if we Asians can make it without welfare, and if we can succeed at school, why can't you [other minorities do so]?"

Regarding problems at UMASS/Amherst, Nguyen placed the blame on the administration and faculty. Leadership at the university has consistently served as a means of social control instead of serving to create conditions for positive social change. For example, when a group of students has occasion to demand its civil rights or when there is a racial conflict, the university immediately sets up committees to diffuse the problem. People are "dragged into long drawn out discussions so that no solutions ever arise." Or, even if recommendations are made, the university finds "a million excuses as to why you can't put them in place." He further charged that "the university has been really successful in separating minority groups." It has done so by using funding as a source for "creating conflict among us, funding for the cultural centers, funding for different programs, funding for even academic courses."

Nguyen said he agreed with Jemison that, "In reality, multiculturalism as defined by UMASS has no real substance, at least none that benefits

---

7 New England Board of Education, *Equity and Pluralism: Full Participation of Blacks and Hispanics in New England Higher Education*, January 1989, p. 10.

8 Ibid.

people of color." He acknowledged that cultural centers and different cultural programs exist but asserted that, nevertheless, "nothing at the university has changed." He noted that the percentages of students of color and faculty of color remain "extremely low," and that the curriculum "has not changed very much."

With few exceptions, the social diversity courses "only reinforce positive stereotypes of minorities," continued Nguyen, and "the core curriculum—what we call 'white studies'—remains intact and unchallenged." He further charged that to deal with racial conflict, multiculturalism tends to:

> look at people of color, to study us, to learn about us, to try to understand us, to tolerate us. However, multiculturalism never looks at white American culture. It never goes into any self-reflection, never examines white racism. [Minority students] are really disgusted with the notion of a predominantly white university trying to understand us without looking at itself.

As just one example of racism in the classroom that remains unexamined, Nguyen mentioned that an economics professor presented and explained an equation and then told the students, "If you don't do it that way, you would be reduced to the mentality of a Bushman." Nguyen commented that for the three students of color in the class, the statement was vulgar," and for the 37 white students "what that professor did was to reinforce to the white students that Africans are inferior, that the Bushmen have no civilization, no culture."

Thus, said Nguyen, with the UMASS administration and faculty not in touch with minority issues or unwilling to address them, minority students encounter:

> forms of racism which are highly disguised and masked behind a friendly face. And this friendly face of racism has successfully enlisted many students of color and wasted our time by encouraging us to put our efforts towards planning activities meant to help whites and minorities to understand . . . and get along with each other. This is a waste of time for us because it is our extracurricular time and also because these programs that we do outside of the classroom are not reinforced in the classroom. . . . For students of color, times haven't really changed.

On the other hand, Nguyen also expected that:

> If you took a survey throughout the campus I am sure most students of color would tell you racism does not exist on this campus because you have given them all these nice programs and cultural centers so we can have some good food and have a good dance once in awhile. But you are not reinforcing our cultural needs . . . [or providing] what we expect in the classroom. . . . We need curriculum changes.

He said that in an introductory philosophy class, "you get Hegel, Plato, Kant, and you are told: that is 'the' philosophy, not 'a' philosophy." Minorities who take such a course are indoctrinated into "thinking that philosophy belongs to white male Europeans." When asked whether Confucius is discussed, Nguyen replied "No." Non-European thinkers "are not referred to, not acknowledged."

Modifying the university's perspective on the core curriculum may be the most important change needed, Ngyuen indicated. For it is one thing to offer African American studies, Asian studies, and the like—that is, ethnic studies which are on the periphery of the core curriculum. "But when you go into English or American history, it is still the same. . . . You are still getting white male European history."

Responding to a question as to whether UMASS/Amherst understands the needs of students of color, Nguyen offered two possible explanations. First, the university may well understand the issues troubling students of color and, therefore, its reactions have been conceived to control those students as he described earlier. Or, second—and Nguyen preferred this explanation:

> the university does not really understand us, and it does not understand itself. If you want to be multicultural, don't look at me, look at yourself first. If you want better relations on campus, look at white racism and why relations are so poor.

In this way, Nguyen suggested that minority students are not the problem and, therefore, are not solely responsible for the solution. Primary responsibility for the solution lies with the "predominant mainstream American culture which happens to be white." He closed by asking the Advisory Committee to help enforce civil rights laws and to "hold the university responsible for what we are saying."

Hillel House

Alisha Meshenberg, of Hillel House and the UMASS Jewish community, stated that she ar-

rived on campus in the fall of 1988 and became active in the Jewish community in "the heat of conflict between the African American community and the Jewish community" when Minister Louis Farrakhan came to speak in January 1989. Despite the conflict and tension that arose, she came to see that "a really good thing" happened when the UMASS office of human relations decided to sponsor a workshop "that tried to bridge the gap that was growing between our communities."

Meshenberg said that the workshop instilled an awareness that more communication could overcome conflict and help foster better understanding. Out of the crisis and workshop emerged the Black/Jewish Coalition, which soon grew popular. A feeling developed that the two groups could communicate, and students became interested in attending the meetings of the Black/Jewish Coalition and in participating in an open factfinding meeting on the issues.

Around Passover of 1989, a multicultural Seder was also sponsored by the Jewish community, and non-Jews attended with representation from members of most of the minority groups on campus. Meshenberg noted that Civility Week was not a byproduct of Farrakhan's visit, but it "definitely helped to increase the communications between the black and Jewish communities and other communities." However, with the passing of summer and the start of the 1990 fall semester, a new crisis developed around the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

> Many Jews were ostracized for identifying with Israel. . . . We lost the status of the underdog and were now [seen] as the evil aggressors, and many people felt that "why should we communicate with the Jewish community?" The Black/Jewish Coalition lost members. . . . Again the multicultural Seder occurred . . . , but less input came from other members of the community . . . and there was a much smaller turnout. Alliances still existed mostly through friendships and not between the communities at large.

In fact, that year cultural events sponsored by Hillel and the Jewish community "were protested and used by some groups as vehicles for misplaced political opinions," said Meshenberg, adding that on Israel Independence Day both 2 years ago and last year, protestors turned that cultural event into something more political. Another example of such politicization occurred when a Jewish student set up in the New Africa House a photography exhibit called visions of Israel; after the opening, some unknown parties put up pictures of aggression against Palestinians and forced the closure of the exhibit for a few days.

The issue before the Advisory Committee was not just about politics but also about the lack of decency that people have been showing by not respecting other members on campus, observed Meshenberg. "No matter whether we share the same politics or not, we must keep the lines of communications open, but it seems that we are losing sight of this." A related problem is that those core groups of students who each year make it a priority to educate themselves about their own groups and those of others represent only a small fraction of the campus. Such student activists "spread themselves so thin and they go to committee after committee to try to solve some problems." Moreover, the knowledge they gain cannot easily be widely shared, and once these few students graduate, it is left to the interested groups who follow "to start over from square one."

Meshenberg noted that in December of 1990 a menorah commemorating Chanukah was erected outside the Hillel House; it was vandalized, forcing Hillel to take it inside to protect it from continued vandalism. Also, members of the fraternity that had occupied the Hillel House before the Jewish community came into its possession stood outside shouting for the Jews to vacate the premises, and disturbing the intercom system until the police arrived.

Meshenberg then mentioned that some faculty members do not allow Jewish students to miss class to observe their religious holidays. "This is a requirement that [the faculty is] required to fulfill, but they often don't, out of ignorance." However, she also noted that one Jewish student reported that recently, just before Yom Kippur, a professor in class pointed out that on Yom Kippur a special event was expected to occur the same day, and the professor announced "To the Jews in the class, you can decide what is more important to you—to attend my class [on Yom Kippur] or not."

In closing, Meshenberg said that she continued to believe in the value of intergroup communications, but she agreed with Greenberg about the need for also developing joint projects. "It seems that discussions are good, but they really do not help our relationships to progress. If we worked on joint projects, maybe we could learn to work

together as a community instead of being divided."

Jeffrey L. Pegram

[Advisory Committee Acting Chairperson Almeida noted that students representing both the Latin American Cultural Center and the Dr. Josephine White Eagle American Indian Cultural Center had been scheduled to appear but apparently were unable to attend. Jeffrey L. Pegram, a UMASS student and the brother of the Native American student who had been scheduled to represent the latter center, participated in a special July 1992 program featured in an August 1992 *New York Times* article on the obstacles encountered by blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans seeking to enroll in college or graduate schools.]

During a 4-week summer program held in Andover, Massachusetts in July 1992 for college graduates seeking to do graduate studies, Jeffrey L. Pegram, a Native American student, recalled a high school guidance counselor "who told him he was only good enough to get into a 2-year college—this to a student whose high grades put him on the dean's list 3 years in a row," according to a recent *New York Times* article:

> "Out of 2,000 students, I was one of 5 Native Americans, and we found out that this guidance counselor had told a lot of people of color that they should go into the Army or a 2-year school," said Mr. Pegram, who graduated this year from the University of Massachusetts and wants to study American Indian history.[9]

The article, which also cited other minority students and their summer program teachers, reported that the advice given to Pegram is a message "familiar to experts who work with minority college students." One teacher in the summer program added that, "even after they start graduate school, the message to them is, 'When are you going to drop out?'"[10]

UMASS Panel of Administrators

Office of Human Relations

Dr. Grant M. Ingle, the director of the office of human relations, said that he is an organizational psychologist and that his duties do not include defending the university but changing it. With help from many people, his office over the years has had as its goal the creation of "a more civil campus, one more reflective and responsive to our increasing cultural diversity."

He observed that a key problem in higher education is that the issues of "racial, religious, and other forms of intimidation and conflict historically have not been seen as anything other than a disruption in the main business of a university." Consequently, his office "fights all the time, trying to get attention to these issues as more than just disruptions." Campus administrators are, typically, unwilling to spend money on preventive activities but become motivated to take corrective steps after a publicized incident, according to Ingle. Incidents are often followed by student demands for change. Administrations delay in responding, but they eventually do respond, which Ingle said he:

> could document in at least three or four major cases in the last 5 years. I keep a scorecard in my office. . . For the most part, 90 percent of the demands have been met, but this has not resulted in significant change.

He pointed out that the assumption is that the implementation of student demands is "somehow going to improve the day-to-day experience of students of color and others on campus" from the creation of cultural centers to refinements in the language of a harassment policy. But "what we are learning is in fact that these changes do not change the quality of life of the students we are concerned about because . . . as has been alluded to before, our student body turns over at a rate of 30 percent a year." As Jemison mentioned earlier, Ingle also noted that many undergraduate students came "from communities with little diversity, from rural areas, and from de facto segregated suburbs out-

---

9 Susan Chira, "Minority Students Tell of Bias in Quest for Higher Education," *New York Times*, Aug. 4, 1992, p. A-1.

10 Ibid.

side of cities, and arrive at the campus full of naive prejudices and stereotypes."

Ingle further asserted that:

> they are literally unprepared in many ways for the kind of cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity this campus offers and they have had no preparation in high school. They have had health education, physical education, and driver's education universally, but not multicultural education. As a consequence, we as an institution are placed in the position of having to do remedial multicultural education for huge numbers of students every year, a task which the university in the best of budgetary times is commonly reluctant to take on and is easily written off as an accessory program.

At the same time, he emphasized that students arrive with some naivete about race and religion and act mostly out of ignorance and not malice. Surveys of newspaper accounts show "that 9 times out of 10, the perpetrator is a white male who has been drinking or is drunk. Furthermore, he is typically a first-year student, but, most critically, accompanied by younger brothers or high school friends from home. Or [the perpetrators] are the high school friends acting alone," said Ingle, adding that "we can train the police. We can refine our systems of grievance for racial harassment, but, frankly, our ability to get to those [high school] visitors to campus is limited." They have lived in neighborhoods or communities "where students or people of color are not found after dark, and what we are seeing is turf behavior from their home communities played out on our campuses."

As recorded in *ADL Conference on Campus Prejudice*, almost 2 years before the factfinding meeting, the then-chancellor of UMASS/Amherst, Joseph Duffey, also touched upon the profile of typical perpetrators. Not wishing to downplay other factors, Duffey told participants at ADL's 1989 conference that:

> . . . a great number of these incidents have to do with alcohol abuse. I do not mean to suggest that racism is not an issue, or that it's all due to alcohol abuse. That's not the case at all. But if you read the set of incidents [outlined in an ADL publication], you will notice at once how many of them are related to the abuse of alcohol, a problem that I think we are still unwilling to acknowledge on most of our campuses.[11]

On a more positive note, at the factfinding meeting Ingle reported that creative approaches have been taken in the UMASS School of Management which has assumed that, if its graduates are to be successful, they must achieve a level of "multicultural fluency in this country and globally." Consequently, the management school attempts to convince its undergraduate and graduate students that such fluency is essential.

Ingle suggested three Federal initiatives: first, a Federal program aimed at incentives—not aimed at requirements—for developing high school multicultural curricula that would be as widespread as driver's education courses. Multicultural curricula and driver's education both share safety as a common goal. Second, since every time Ingle has spoken to Federal agencies about new initiatives those agencies reply, "We are broke, and Massachusetts already has those model civil rights statutes [the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act]," public education must be provided on how to use those statutes for successful prosecution in cases of hate crimes.[12]

Third, as it did in issuing stringent guidelines to address sexual harassment in the workplace, the Federal Government should issue equivalent guidelines on how to combat racial and religious harassment in the campus workplace. Ingle reported that the sexual harassment policy of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission had a significant impact in reducing sexual harassment on campuses including at UMASS, and a similar effort should be made regarding racial and religious harassment.

Office of the Dean of Students

Dr. Sharon Kipetz, the interim dean of students, stated that the student panelists "very well named a lot of the problems and different directions in which we need to go." She said that the

---

11 *ADL Conference on Campus Prejudice*, p. 27.

12 Mass. Gen. L. Ann., ch. 12 § 111 (West 1986). See also Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Stemming Violence and Intimidation Through the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act*, December 1988, and *Community Perspectives on the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act*, March 1991.

faculty is working on integrating some of those ideas in the academic setting, and that her office is moving the matter a step farther into the policies influencing the direction of the university. In the 13 years that she has been involved, much work has been done to develop stronger rights and responsibilities, but one problem seems to be that "not enough students are coming forward and choosing to use their rights and responsibilities in the university to press charges."

She reported that in March 1991, Project Pulse, a research and evaluation arm of her office, conducted a survey of the students of color on campus. A positive finding was that "students did feel confident in the university's ability to respond effectively to specific incidents of racial and ethnic harassment and to move forward with those cases."[13] However, a negative finding was that "students stated that this has been a problem for them and is an ongoing problem."

Kipetz mentioned that Project Pulse is also conducting a survey to see what methods and what direction the university should take to work on harassment issues. There will be a series of telephone surveys on different topics involving members of the community, the faculty, staff, and student groups. She was gratified that "the campus community is beginning to work as a whole and is moving forward in the same direction. Our chancellor's debate the other night . . . was a good first step in opening up dialogue in which we can talk about our issues and talk about ways to resolve our problems." In closing, she implored the Advisory Committee to talk with the legislature and with the Federal Government to provide the funding needed to sustain the work of her office and the university. Among other things, her office needs to continue Project Pulse in order to evaluate the programs of her office "and to look critically at where we are going. . . ."

M. Ricardo Townes, the associate dean of students in charge of academic support services, thanked the Advisory Committee and staff for holding the factfinding meeting. He also thanked the panelists for participating but then felt compelled to "air a brief note of cynicism." His understanding was that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is part of the Bush administration, which he described as having resorted to "racialisms like Willie Horton ads, and calling the civil rights legislation a quota bill when it is not." Townes also believed that a representative of the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education was present at the factfinding meeting, and Townes alluded to recent controversies which that Office has been embroiled in.

He then referred to the problem of the lack of financial resources affecting the ability of students to attend college. The student panelists were correct in that matter and in their assessment of other difficulties. But Townes further noted that:

> since the early eighties, the University of Massachusetts has improved its responsiveness to issues of racial intolerance. Ten years or so ago, we just didn't know how to deal with them. Today we are a lot better at it. I think we are to be commended for that.

Nevertheless, asserted Townes, the university and the Nation "are either unwilling or unable to face the issue of race or racism." Not wanting to seem to offend members of any other community—whether it be the gay community or the Jewish community—Townes also felt compelled to say that:

> when an incident occurred involving racial intolerance, before we addressed that particular issue, we threw every other issue into the same pie, and we never faced race and racism, which has been a part of this country for too long, a separate issue that needs its own attention, that needs its own strategies. It's a very complex problem, and when we always group all of our issues together, we never seem to focus on the issue of race.

Furthermore, Townes voiced his belief that even students of color may not fully appreciate the needs of other students of color. He said that Asian students, for example, are usually thought of as one group of students, when in fact there are 15 different Asian students organizations on campus, each with slightly different needs and obviously different cultures and different languages.

---

13 See Julie A. Lam, Project Pulse: Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office, "Racial and Ethnic Harrassment Survey," University of Massachusetts at Amherst, undated, p. 4. However, Cape Verdean and black students were the most likely to say that they were not so confident.

Before a program is started for Asian students, "we ought to be aware that there is a rich cultural diversity within that group." Many similarly assume that African Americans are a monolithic group of people. But, said Townes, "there is as much diversity in the African community as there is in any other community. African students in this community are not all the same, and we need to start to understand those needs before we start the program."

Eastern Regional Office Director John I. Binkley corrected Townes' description of the relationship of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to the Bush administration, explaining that the Commission is an independent agency. Even though the President does appoint some members of the Commission, those members and the Commission may differ with the President on many matters. Binkley noted, for example, that Commission Chairperson Arthur A. Fletcher has taken issue with President Bush over the President's refusal to support and pass the 1990 civil rights act in 1990.[14]

UMASS Public Safety Department

Dr. Arthur Hilson, the executive director for public safety at UMASS, said that two programs he oversees are security and the police department. Commenting on the earlier charges by students that persons of color on campus are stopped by the police on the basis of their color, Hilson acknowledged that, "In spite of all of our initiatives, racism still flourishes on this campus." To deal with it, his office has developed "an early warning system which means that whenever there is an incident on campus, anytime, day or night, that report is made through me up the line to the chancellor." If the incident appears to be racial or anti-Semitic, or even rape, there are five people on-call with beepers 24-hours a day, 7 days a week, who are part of the counter disorder unit (CDU) and trained to respond and commence investigations immediately.

In addition, more UMASS police have been taken out of cruisers and put on bikes and horses to increase their visibility and acceptability in the community. "People will come up and pet a horse. They don't pet cruisers, and this changes the image of what police are about." Quoted in the *New York Times* on the subject, Hilson added that the use of mounted police also did "wonders for police morale."[15]

Hilson pointed out to the Advisory Committee that the UMASS police are put through "social issues training," although he bemoaned the fact that the police profession is the only profession that hires practitioners without first requiring that they be trained. He explained that all that is required is that the applicant has a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma. After being hired, the applicant then goes to the police academy, is trained, armed, and sent out to enforce the law. This can mean that an 18-year-old male "suddenly has a gun on his side" and is trained from a military viewpoint to be aware of the enemy who is "the person out in the community." He added that "The incident in Los Angeles is not an isolated police incident. The guns, the training, and the mind set is that they are out there to protect themselves, and that's understandable."

To improve matters, Hilson proposed that college training be required for applicants and, once hired, the police officer should be subject to removal if found "guilty of unprofessional or uncivil behavior." He acknowledged, however, that bargaining contracts make it almost impossible to discharge an officer from the police department, and some modification must be made. Hilson said that he was "most impressed" with the UMASS student panelists who appeared earlier and that he has since asked them to address his advisory board and the entire police department. "We can develop programs all day in our office, but it does not necessarily meet the needs of those we are committed to serve."

---

14 However, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166, was signed by President Bush on Nov. 21, 1991. See Andrew Rosenthal, "Reaffirming Commitment, Bush Signs Rights Bill; President Tries to Quell Furor on Interpreting Scope of New Law," *New York Times*, Nov. 22, 1991, p. A-1.

15 "Three Police Horses Are Put to Work as 'Ice Breakers,'" *New York Times*, Sept. 3, 1989, p. 52. Hilson is also cited as saying, "I think the police are not held in the highest esteem. I want to try and override that sense of distrust."

UMASS Faculty Panel

Afro-American Studies Department

Dr. Esther Terry, the chairperson of the Afro-American studies department, noted that she had "been at the university long enough to have been the teacher of the young man who stood up to say that nothing has changed in 20 years." Upon agreeing to take part in the factfinding meeting, Terry said that her initial impulse was to document all of the efforts that she and others have exerted outside of their teaching specialties and research responsibilities to help "ensure that all of our different students are free to pursue their studies in a supportive, civil, and nonhostile environment." She thought of recounting the vast number of commissions, task forces and workshops and teach-ins that she and her colleagues had been part of over the years.

But Terry decided to bypass all that "to get to get to the crux of the matter and the reason" that all the participants had come to the factfinding meeting. She asserted that:

> To date our very best laid plans and strategies have not worked. We still have on our campus far too many instances of aggressive intolerance that do violence, sometimes to the body and often to the spirit of the people who come to us for education and enlightenment. We seem not to have found quite the way to make our diverse populations respect and truly value each other for their differences. . . .
>
> We claim membership in a special and important community, a university community. Our unique members come from across the State largely, but also from the Nation, and indeed, the world, to learn from us and each other . . . before they leave to take leadership positions in a very, very diverse world. Now that is what we believe is our ideal. So why cannot we get on with that ideal and have done with the barbarous prejudices, bigotries, and cruelties that blight our academic community?

Terry offered one explanation as to why. The students, faculty, and staff come from the world, carrying with them "all of the prejudices and narrow-mindedness that exists in the larger society. And, because of our structure, we get several thousand such newcomers each year." She also admitted that "the university and all of our best efforts alone will not suffice to solve the problem." Still, although she confessed to not knowing how to do it, she believed that "we all must hear each other, work continuously with each other, to take back the university and indeed our society from those who would ground us. I think we need to do it until we do it right."

Legal Studies Department

Dr. Stephen Arons, of the legal studies department, explained that he had spent much of his professional life dealing with the institutional dimensions of racism and with the first amendment, leading him to address the university's legal responsibility in the matter of racial harassment. He observed that over the previous 3 or 4 years a national debate has raged around what is alleged to be a conflict between the principles of freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry contained in the first amendment, and the principle of racial equality and dignity.

Arons suggested that the debate "mischaracterizes the actual nature of the problems of racial and other forms of harassment" particularly on campus. He indicated that the issue in these matters is:

> to provide equality of access to education, primarily in the form of the first amendment, so that if we understand the university at bottom to be dependent upon the preservation of freedom to inquire and freedom to read, freedom to teach, all the academic freedoms which come under the rubric of the first amendment, then we see the problem of harassment as one in which some people are deprived of these freedoms and others are not.

To illustrate his point, Arons related a story about a young black female student who had taken two courses with him including an advanced course 3 or 4 years ago. She had proven herself to be a very good student. However, about two-thirds of the way through the advanced course, Arons assigned students to compose a legal memorandum on public school segregation. The student failed to hand in the assignment on time, and 2 weeks after the deadline she went to Arons to discuss the problem.

After briefly touching upon the substantive matter, she finally admitted that it seemed to her hypocritical or dishonest to work on the assignment. It turned out that during a walk outside she had recently been verbally assaulted by about six white males:

> a couple of whom she recognized to be students at the university. . . and she was subjected to the most horrifying

and degrading kind of comments . . . based both on her race and also on her gender, and she was so frightened by this . . . it recalled so much of the images out of a 250-year history in this country that she felt unable to concentrate on her work.

Arons asked her if she had reported the incident to the police or other authorities, but it became "clear that she was too fearful and indeed ashamed of what happened to her to talk about it with any authority figure and, further, that she felt that the result of doing so would not at all be to her advantage, that no solution would be forthcoming."

The student never finished the paper or the course, and "her level of emotional distress was so great that she [transferred] to a predominantly black university." Arons viewed the story as not just an example of what can happen at UMASS and at other colleges but as also illustrating the resultant emotional distress that can preclude people from "participating in the very first amendment process of inquiry, of learning and teaching, of holding and exploring beliefs, which is guaranteed by the first amendment." For this reason, Arons characterized the challenge as one of securing the first amendment freedoms rather than as one in which "there is a tension between these freedoms and important issues of equality and dignity."

Arons then framed four principles that can be learned from reflection on the story and a study of the first and 14th amendments. First, the first amendment protects and even "defines the very nature of the university" since the freedoms of inquiry, belief, opinion and expression, and the freedom to teach and to learn fall within the purview of the first amendment. Thus, the first amendment is "absolutely essential to the understanding of why we are here."

Second, one of the worst injuries that can result from racial and "other forms of insidious verbal and expressive harassment are the injuries which are so severe that they deprive a person of their right to participate in the first amendment processes." Consequently, third, what needs to be done is to find a way to secure not just for the bigot but for everyone the right to participate in this process. Fourth, there are legally useful and constitutionally permissible theories making it possible to sanction and punish expressions of racial and other harassment. Arons mentioned that UMASS faculty, staff, students, and others have been working on these theories, and some weeks after the factfinding meeting, a group will "present to the campus for debate and discussion, and, one hopes, for action some very specific proposals as to how this kind of activity can be sanctioned in the future."

Just this summer, however, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling in *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul* casting doubt on the constitutionality of speech codes at public colleges which had been formulated "to shield minorities and others from offensive remarks," according to a June 1992 *Washington Post* news story.[16] The ruling does not necessarily affect private institutions of higher education, but it is estimated that 100 to 200 or more public institutions will have to review their existing codes against hate speech. Moreover, a law professor at the private Stanford University said that, "our view is that we should be held to the same standards as public institutions," as reported in a June 1992 *New York Times* article.[17]

Spanish and Portuguese Department

Dr. Javier Cevallos, of the Spanish and Portuguese department, said that, though there are only a few Hispanics at UMASS, Hispanics do teach in all departments. Of the 27 Hispanic faculty, 4 were born in Spain, 2 are Portuguese born in Portugal, and 20 were Latino. He agreed with the student panelists on the lack of faculty of color, and admitted that "I find my role is the role of the token Hispanic in meetings because there is nobody else." He explained that there are only 20 Latinos but 200 committees.

Noting that Hispanics come in all skin colors, Cevallos said that "We are not defined by an ethnic or racial background [but] by language. We have one language in common, and language is a very important tool that has been used against some of the Hispanics." As a student of color had said earlier of his use of a non-English language,

16 Mary Jordan, "Ruling Seen Stifling Controversial Campus Speech Codes," *Washington Post*, June 23, 1992, p. A-6.

17 William Celis, 3rd, "Universities Reconsidering Bans on Hate Speech," *New York Times*, June 24, 1992, p. A-13.

Cevallos asserted that there have been "countless incidents on campus" of Hispanic students being told to speak English or that Hispanics are noisy, and such remarks lead to "linguistic discrimination and to linguistic intimidation."

He added that many are afraid of speaking Spanish, and that he once was afraid. But "now I speak in Spanish intentionally in meetings where I know that people don't speak Spanish." On the other hand, he pointed out that he is also beginning to observe "inner group discrimination," with Hispanics discriminating against other Hispanics on the basis of success:

> meaning to be white or to have what the middle-class American whites have—white picket fences, a family, and two cars in the garage. If I'm successful, that means it's because I'm better than ourselves. If I can do it as a Hispanic, then other Hispanics are not as good as I am.

Cevallos reminded the Advisory Committee that access to college is being denied to larger numbers of students of all colors and ethnic backgrounds because they lack sufficient education. Those that can enroll have to take remedial courses in reading and math. "We are not only asking a university to do remedial work, we are asked to do remedial work to survive." He thought that "it is a very tough job to ask campuses and universities around the country to do all that in facing all the budget cuts and all the problems we are having" and closed by saying, "I think it is time for the government to put its money where its mouth is."

English Department

Dr. John Hunt, of the English Department, observed that UMASS/Amherst has greatly changed. When he arrived 24 years ago, there were no Afro-American studies, no women's studies, no Social Issues Training Project for dormitory staff. However, he agreed with Terry that the problems are still not solved. But he also believed that the problems may ultimately not be amenable to solutions. He arrived at this conclusion because:

> people come to this university from a country whose population most basically is characterized as abrasion between groups, large groups against small groups, groups against each other in a country which is very spacious. You can relieve the pressure and the potential for conflict because there is space to move around. . . . On a university campus you are jammed together, so you are going to get abrasion, and it is going to constantly arise.

What is needed, explained Hunt, are counterbalancing forces, and that is what a university should provide. "It is supposed to be a counterbalancing force to the abrasion and hurt." The faculty is also needed to make a difference, but since UMASS aspires to be a "world class research university," faculty members experience an uneasiness about time "not spent madly preparing your classes or doing research." Thus, the demand on them precludes their devoting attention to the lives students lead outside of the classroom, and as long as this situation prevails, "nothing will happen. We will be having these meetings forever."

Hunt's "own feeling is that we . . . need to work on a mode of institutional redefinition so that the faculty can be relieved of their uneasiness." He indicated that one instrument that has shown some success is the chancellor's Commission on Civility and Human Relations established in 1980 in response to several anti-Semitic incidents. Composed of "faculty, staff, and an insufficient number of students, it acts as a sort of free radical," having access to the chancellor, though "it does not fit in anywhere. It's not in the structure, any power structure. It does not report to anything and simply makes its own agenda for what needs attention on campus," such as the Persian Gulf War in 1990, and on multiculturalism and "political correctness," the latter topic debated at the chancellor's forum earlier during the week of the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting.[18]

Hunt emphasized that it is not the specific activities that the chancellor's commission sponsors but the larger statement it makes, "that this place stands for certain things, and those things in fact do not allow for the kind of abrasion and conflict and hurt which prohibits the tranquil and productive enjoyment of the experience of a university." He closed by pointing out that "we must not hope

---

18 See Michael Levy, "Discussion Diverse at Free Inquiry Debate," *Massachusetts Daily Collegian*, Sept. 26, 1991. The title of the debate was "Multiculturalism: Foe or Ally of Free Inquiry." It involved three UMASS/Amherst professors and one from Hampshire College.

for conclusions. There is no conclusion. There is the demand, the necessity to be the countervailing force."

Plant and Soil Sciences Department

Haim Gunner explained that he was appearing in several capacities, since he was "the longest serving and probably the oldest" member of the chancellor's Commission on Civility and Human Relations, president of the board of directors of Hillel House, and cochair of the Jewish Faculty, Professional, and Staff Group. He said that he, too, had been moved and impressed by the student panelists, but at the same time pointed to the "enormous change which has happened on this campus since I arrived in 1963, evidence of which is the fact that we are here speaking in a candor which was simply unheard of even a decade ago."

As a member of the Jewish community, Gunner noted that the Jewish experience on campus can be viewed as a bridge to the complexity of the minority experience. The Jewish experience is unique, he said, since Jews welcome diversity and view themselves as part of the ethnic mosaic, but Jews have also been lumped together with "the white oppressive racist majority." Moreover, not only have Jews been assaulted by skinheads but Jews have also frequently had to suffer "what has to be bluntly described as black and brown racism." He explained that the latter phenomenon could typically be labeled "Israel bashing" associated with the controversy over the status of the Palestinians.

Gunner suggested that the effect is to subject Jewish students to "an ambiance of fear, of epithets, and of potential violence" similar to what blacks, Asian Americans, Cape Verdeans, Native Americans, and other minority students face. The challenge is to determine what to do about it, he said, adding that the predicament is difficult for the university "because it cannot socially engineer. We [earlier] heard references to controlling social action." Teaching environmental science, Gunner said that he is "sometimes looked at strangely because I bring issues of race and gender to the lecture platform. But we as faculty have to lose this sense of embarrassment, this sense of estrangement in terms of what we believe. . . ."

He closed by describing a graduate course which brought trainers into the residence halls on anti-Semitic awareness and gay and lesbian awareness. Eliminated because of budget tightening at the university, such courses must be restored and amplified, said Gunner, and among the faculty, a sense of responsibility in the classroom must be generated to acknowledge and welcome diversity and to buttress it in the university by making "sure that good will is reinforced by structural supports." While acknowledging that Meshenberg had well described the hardships that Jewish students encountered when attempting to build bridges, Gunner stressed that "in the end it is going to have to be the creation of a bridge by the students themselves that will help to heal and to rectify these hurts. Certainly you now must undertake a leadership role."

3. Smith College

> In my 19 years of living, I have never experienced as much racism as I have at Smith College.
>
> Kamina A. Henderson, Student
> Smith College

> If we can build a consensus that recognizes that even unintended discrimination is terribly hurtful and harmful and that each of us is personally responsible for our unintended racism, we may be able to create educational settings that are as welcoming and comfortable for people of color as they have been for centuries for others.
>
> Fletcher A. Blanchard, Professor
> Smith College

Smith College Student Panel

Indigenous Americans of Smith College

Representing the Indigenous Americans of Smith College, Karen Cooke explained that the organization included only five members, four of them Alaskan Natives, since Smith College had little recent success in recruiting Native Americans from the lower 48 States. An Innuit Eskimo, Cooke said that she had not experienced any overt racism; "no one comes up to me calling me names or doing Indian calls." However, subtle racism has occurred and that which annoyed her most stemmed from a lack of information. For example, her Smith College classmates would ask: "Do you live in an igloo? Do you speak English in Alaska?" Cooke wondered what such ignorance revealed about the education received by American children.

She stated that, "I am really in touch with my culture. People resent this because you don't blend in. 'Why don't you become American, take part in the American culture?'" they ask. Cooke noted that she is an indigenous person of America, "Yet I come here, and you come to me and tell me to change the way I live, the language I speak, the food I eat." She also reported that when minority students associate with other minority students, the majority students "think we are trying to isolate ourselves from the majority, which is when we start feeling defensive and don't want to integrate with other students." Cooke further observed that most white students have many white friends. "They may have one black friend, or one Chinese friend, or one Latino friend. But their closest friends are people of their same ethnic background."

Smith College implements the Bridge Program, one element of which involves first year students and new students of color meeting to talk about racism and miseducation. Cooke said that she did not mind educating people about Eskimos; it was just that she was "tired of having to be the only person carrying this weight." People approached her and would "only talk to you about things of your ethnic background. All they see is your color. So in this sense, they are telling me, 'All I want to know about you is what you can tell me about your culture. . . . Your personal interests don't matter to me.'"

Cooke reported that instructors at Smith College speak about Native Americans and indigenous people as savages. When the administration claims that it is looking for people of color to serve on the faculty, the administration also claims that it cannot find any. Her interpretation of what the administration means is that, "You are not educated enough to come here and teach." With the Federal Government cutting back on support for education, among the first things cut are those relating to ethnicity including minority recruitment. That in turn would lead to an increase in racism.

She admitted that racism exists in Alaska as it does in Massachusetts. Alaska has at least half a million inhabitants, 13 percent of whom are Alas-

kan Natives. Referring to what Cevallos had said of Hispanics at UMASS, Cooke stated that some Alaskan Natives believe that to be prosperous one needs to be white and have the things related to white culture: money, cars, and the like. Her own family is middle class, and although her family has things which pertain to the white culture, her mother remained involved with the Innuit culture and language, and thus, there did not have to be such conflicts.

Hillel of Smith College

Liza Deman stated that she represented Hillel of Smith College and the Jewish community on campus. She expressed gratitude for being invited to participate because:

> we are so rarely included in programs about discrimination or intolerance on our own campus. For example, 2 years ago Smith College held its Otelia Cromwell Day, a day-long education workshop on the experiences of minorities.[1] Jewish students were not included in the planning process, and there were no workshops on anti-Semitism or the Jewish experience. It seemed that every other form of ethnic discrimination was represented. In that first year when a group of Jewish students and professors complained, we were informed by the administration that anti-Semitism was not considered a form of racism.

The same year that saw the start of Otelia Cromwell Day, "a book was found defaced and covered with swastikas and racial slurs," continued Deman; "obviously our enemies think we are a race." Though workshops on anti-Semitism have since become part of the program, Deman charged that "Hillel and the Jewish community are consistently not invited to be a part of the planning committee for that day."

She observed that Smith College "is deeply attached to its past." Up to 1969, 15 percent of the school population was Jewish, but has since fallen to less than 5 percent. "There has been a rabbi on campus for some 40-odd years, but he was not given an office until 1967." She also reported that a benediction in which the name of Jesus was often referred to continued to be used. "Religious minorities are made to feel alien" in other ways. As an example, Deman stated that she "was coaxed into attending the annual Smith Vespers Concert in November," an event funded by the Smith College administration. Though told it was to be nondenominational and "not too Christmasy," she complained that she found herself sitting through 2 hours of Christmas music and celebration.

With the majority of the student body being white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, Deman stated that:

> most of the students are not willing to go out of their way to attend to the rest of us. We feel that many of the problems we face are the result of ignorance, but we also need the support of the administration. It must be recognized that we are a minority group. We are left out of the white population. We are not Protestant.

She stressed that a fundamental change should take place on campus to recognize that Jewish students have needs similar to those of other minority students.

Asian Students Association of Smith College

An officer of the organization, Caroline Wing represented the Asian Students Association of Smith College. She credited Smith College for its good intentions in establishing the Bridge Program, earlier referred to by Cooke, and the Smith College Design for Diversity, which Wing described as a long-range plan seeking to increase the percentage of women of color to 20 percent and to increase the percentage of faculty of color by the year 2000. Wing said that the Design's goal for students has already been achieved, but efforts regarding the faculty have "not been all that successful. The percentage of faculty of color [at Smith College] is surprisingly low, and I have heard rumors that it may be even going lower."

Despite implementation of the Bridge Program and the Design plan, "it has been my feeling that the administration has not done much for women of color on campus," continued Wing. She referred to the establishment of cultural centers and the struggle for space for them; apparently the administration had not foreseen the growth in numbers of cultural organizations and their sizes. She

---

1 See also Maria Ostumi, "Otelia Cromwell Day to Celebrate Diversity," *Smith College Sophian*, Sept. 26, 1991, p. 1. A native American was to be the keynote speaker.

explained that for 10 years Asian students have had to borrow space from the Black Student Alliance, although the administration had earlier promised the Asian students their own space. Last year, the black students associated with the Alliance told the Asian students that it was time that the administration provide the promised space. After the Asian students went to the administration, it "basically ignored the issue. We did not get any response until we staged a weeklong sit-in."

Similar to what a UMASS panelist had said about cultural centers at the Amherst campus, Wing charged that, "there was an attempt also for the [Smith College] administration to pit cultural organizations against one another." After the Asian students made their demands for space, the administration responded that, "'We'll just have to take some away from the Black Students Alliance then.'" The black students then "felt they could not support us. . . ."

Wing also offered an example of the administration's apathy. Three years ago, there were incidents involving racist notes. After the first such incident:

> the administration said that they would do everything they could to find the culprit. . . . To this day I do not know whether or not the culprits have been apprehended or even if they have been identified. The following year another racist note was written, and my feeling was that it was written because the administration refused to take a stand against a racial incident of this sort.

She closed by saying that she was in favor of the Bridge and Design programs and that she would like to believe that Smith College has good intentions.

Nosotras

Elizabeth Solernou, the cochairperson of Nosotras, a Latina students organization whose name means "Us" in Spanish, said that her Smith College experience has been "positive in the way I have been getting an excellent education but negative in the way of my race." As a Latina, she suggested that the administration and faculty do not recognize Latinos as a minority. "We are often put in the middle or put aside. They always say it's a black and white issue. But we are not all black. We are not white. We are Latino." She explained that when Latina students make demands, "what usually happens is that they will nod, and nothing happens."

In terms of the Design for Diversity plan and its goal of 20 percent minority, Solernou observed that "most of the Latino population in the United States is concentrated in the inner cities. [Smith] College does not go and recruit in the inner cities, so the Design does not do anything for Latinos." She estimated that the class of 1990 was 20 percent Latino, but in 1991, it fell to 16 percent, and she guessed that in 1992, it may drop down to 10 percent. She said that the administration has not addressed this.

Solernou charged that the administration does not "consider the fact that some professors are openly racist in their classrooms." She said that a friend was in class when her professor used the terms Chicano and Latino in a derogatory way. Her friend told the professor that she considered the comments as racist, but "the professor just walked out. The professor did not address the student in any way, and I personally don't think that is the best way to address such an issue."

She also reported that the introductory American history course does not address the Chicano movement or what happened in the 1848 war with Mexico, an issue of concern to the Latino population. She noted, too, that for 2 years an entire day was set aside as Otelia Cromwell Day, but "this year it is 7 hours. How can we address the problems of racism in 7 hours?" She characterized the Bridge Program as "very positive." But the administration does not sustain its support for students of color as evidenced by the incidents of the racist notes: "you go and ask the administrators, 'What has happened?' [And they respond] 'it's still under investigation.'"

Responding to a question from Dr. Ivor J. Echols, the Connecticut Advisory Committee Chairperson, who observed that the problems seem to repeat themselves each generation and who inquired if minority alumnae might be helpful, Solernou said that it has been difficult learning which Latinas graduated from Smith College even just 10 years ago. She believed that, "the administration has been uncooperative in not giving us a list of alumnae." However, there has been a Latina professor who had attended Smith College in 1975, and despite the difficulties, the Latina students have been trying to build a network of alumnae.

That alumnae may be helpful can be seen in a June 1991, *Washington Post* article by a black Harvard University alumnus and researched by

another black graduate of the same school. Entitled "How to Survive Campus Bigotry: Advice on Coping With Racism—From Grads Who've Been Through It," it offers and explains nine recommendations by several other black graduates for consideration by black students across the country.[2] More recently, an August 31, 1992 *New York Times* article reported on the increase in the number of minority alumni organizations established at universities. A black alumnus involved in workshops and seminars for current students at his alma mater pointed out that, "We're not into nostalgia; we're about business, about bettering the situation for the next generation."[3]

In closing, Solernou emphasized that, "we need to take action fast if we are going to have the multiculturalism we need to address the issues of race, not only by bringing minority people into the university but by talking to people, communicating and taking action."

Student Worker in Admissions

Lucille Smith, a senior, and agreed with Terry, the UMASS faculty panelist, that change can come about only with the involvement of everyone. She noted that she has been a participant and leader in the Bridge Program every year and that:

> I will write letters to students telling them to come to the college. I will be there if they want to call. I have worked with Smith College admissions and was the first intern for minority recruitment of women of color. I designed the program. . . . I have been into the inner cities. I have recruited . . . and have encouraged other people to recruit from the inner cities.

Stressing that admissions workers may strive with dedication, she acknowledged that their styles may differ, and that many will not or cannot afford to go into the inner cities. "You've got to have the funds. There is no way around it. . . . We need the funds. I do not see the funds."

As for the faculty, she said that in her sophomore year she asked an African American professor whom she admired whether she would be leaving. When the professor asked her what she meant, she replied that, "faculty here at Smith College always leave. Everytime I turn around they are gone. I'll get attached to one, and they are gone," and this has a crucial impact because faculty role models of color are important for students of color.

Lucille Smith admitted that when she first attended classes, the courses raised her enthusiasm, although some became less than she had expected. However, she added, "that's all right. They are in a changing process." In her freshman year, there were just a few courses on peoples of African descent, and they were basically concentrated in the African American department. At the time of the factfinding meeting, a guidebook inventoried "what classes have cultural representation and which classes in each department I can go to and find a specific cultural representation. That's a good key to me, something to let me know Smith College is working on it."

She also believed it important for all professors to examine their classes to see whether students of color are enrolled, and, if not, what changes should be made to correct any omission. "You have to tie everybody into your subject. There are a lot of professors at Smith College who do it wonderfully." However, the responsibility for change is everyone's responsibility, suggested Lucille Smith, asking "Can you look at yourself today and know what you have done to help make these changes happen?"

Black Students Alliance

Like Solernou, Kamina A. Henderson, the immediate past chairperson of the Black Students Alliance, stated that she had both positive and negative experiences at Smith College, but added that, "in my 19 years of living, I have never experienced as much racism as I have at Smith College." A junior, Henderson explained that it was not necessary to go back 3 years to find racial incidents. She said that in December 1990, a student found a decapitated black doll on her premises, an unpublicized incident never mentioned. She wondered why there is no discussion of such problems.

---

2 Paul Ruffins, "How to Survive Campus Bigotry: Advice on Coping With Racism—From Grads Who've Been Through It," *Washington Post*, June 16, 1991, p. B-2. See app. B.

3 Karen DeWitt, "Minority Alumni Find a New Voice," *New York Times*, Aug. 31, 1992, p. A-8.

Referring to the space issue first mentioned by Wing, Henderson charged that "there was a deliberate attempt by the administration to cause dissension among cultural groups." She stated that the administration told the chairperson of the Asian Students Association that she needed to talk to the Black Students Alliance about giving up space. Henderson said, "that is not our responsibility; that is the administration's responsibility to attend to the needs of the students, and I don't see that as having happened at Smith College."

Noting that the Black Student Alliance "has a reputation for being very vocal all the time," she believed that "all the women on this panel can tell you honestly that the only way we have of achieving progress is through confrontation, sit-ins." On the space issue, she stated that, "it's a shame we had to sit-in. I missed class time, and I know a lot of other students missed class time. . . . I have other extracurricular activities, and I don't always have time to sit-in."

Henderson noted, too, that during the sit-in, someone on the president's staff came out and sprayed air-freshener in the halls while students were sleeping there during the sit-in. "That was racist," Henderson charged, but "you never hear about these things. . . . you never hear anybody really saying anything negative about what's going on."

She also remembered that when she first prepared to attend Smith College, she was impressed by a publication mentioning the 20 percent representation of minorities and then saw a number of women of color when she arrived. However:

> what they did not tell you in the publication was what they were going to do when the people got here. . . . I thought this is going to be a great atmosphere for diversity. But I find I have to defend myself all the time. "Why do you need space? Why do you all need time for yourselves?" That should be obvious. When people are being racially harassed, people receive racist attitudes from the administration, it should be obvious.

Furthermore, regarding the 20 percent goal, she remarked that upon distinguishing the subgroups it will be seen that, "there are a large number of Asians . . . and that's great and wonderful. We also have to look at it and see that the number of black students has dropped and the number of Latino students." In order to create a truly diverse atmosphere at Smith College, the number of all minority students has to be increased.

As to solutions, Henderson agreed with Nguyen of the UMASS student panel, that "we spend a lot of time in meetings with administrators talking about what we are going to do" and possible solutions. But she also noted that after the Smith College president went on sabbatical, "in less than 2 months, there was a solution [to the space issue] that we all agreed on" involving the acting president.

Smith College Administrator/Faculty Panel

[Though Smith College president Mary Maples Dunn had been the first invitee to agree to participate on the factfinding meeting's originally scheduled date, once that date was rescheduled, it proved impossible for her to be at the factfinding meeting site on the new date. Instead, she was interviewed at Smith College, and a videotape of the interview was shown during the factfinding meeting and recorded as part of the transcript.]

Office of the College President

Dr. Mary Maples Dunn, the president of Smith College, described a vision of the college as a community made up of many diverse parts joined together by a common purpose. Although the vision or dream has not yet been reached, Dunn said that she was hopeful that "we are on the way.". She acknowledged that:

> we have had incidents of racism on our campus just as every other campus in the United States has had, and several years ago in the midst of a great deal of unhappiness, particularly for our African American students, we decided that it was time to change the way in which we approached these things.

An August 1989 *Springfield Sunday Republican* article offered examples of incidents at Smith College. In the 1988-89 school year, "several minority students received anonymous racist notes slipped under their doors or pinned to message boards of the dormitory rooms. Racist graffiti were found spray-painted on the steps of the campus' cultural

center in 1986. . . ."[4] Regarding the spray-painting incident, a May 1987 issue of *Black Issues in Higher Education* reported that Dunn "took quick action by removing the graffiti from the cultural center's steps immediately and convening a meeting of the entire college to discuss the racism issue."[5] Although not referring to Smith College, the specialist in combating bigotry cited earlier has also written that:

> The most important rule is the simplest to effectuate. When an incident occurs, the university at its highest level, must respond immediately and strongly. Presidents must make themselves as public as possible and say—in the most powerful words—that bigotry has no place on campus.[6]

In her taped remarks, Dunn said that throughout the country, when a racial incident occurred on campus, college students would make a series of demands on the institution including improving diversity in admissions, hiring additional minority faculty, modifying curricula, and providing space for use by those students. On the other side, college administrators would "typically give as much as they needed to give in order to get the temperature to go down, and then you would move away from that project all together," according to Dunn.

As reported by the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* in January 1988, this phenomenon was also noted by Frederick A. Hurst, a former Commissioner of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. Hurst had investigated the incidents at UMASS/Amherst after the 1986 World Series, and he issued a report on the problems at the campus. During a January 1988 conference at the College of William and Mary, he contended that, "college administrators try to create a perception of change in the place of real change," and that many top administrators admit they have a problem, but then sit back to see if the tension becomes defused. If it does, many do nothing else, according to Hurst.[7]

In her video address, Dunn went on to say that after the incident she decided that it was time to take up the issue and give it "the highest institutional priority and the priority of presidential leadership." The attempt involved a systematic self-examination, resulting in the *Smith College Design for Institutional Diversity.* An approach to the issue of diversity on many fronts, the Design addressed the need for goals on student admissions, the hiring of faculty and staff, and curriculum changes. The Design also tried to go beyond those fronts by attempting to educate the entire community on the meaning of diversity and diversity's importance to the college community.[8] Dunn believed that by being proactive the college has been able to achieve certain kinds of success. She reported that good progress had been made on some of the goals for admissions and in faculty hiring.

Calabia noted that the terms "goals" and "quotas" tend to provoke controversy when affirmative action is discussed; he asked Dunn if she made any distinctions between goals and quotas.[9] Dunn replied that she does; for her, "quotas carry a command quality to them" requiring one to "fill a quota without the necessary attention to quality." Goals, on the other hand, "you establish for yourself, allowing you to maintain the criteria for quality that you have. . . ." She further explained that when some people complain even about having goals, she points out that:

> when we go out to raise money, we always have to have a goal because it is very hard to go out and say to people, "I would like to have some money." They always want to

---

4 William Fosher, "Minorities Lose Ground on Campus: First Step Launched at Smith," *Springfield Sunday Republican* (Springfield Mass.), Aug. 6, 1989, p. B-1.

5 Dennis Schatzman, "Rise in Racism Produces Response—a News Commentary," *Black Issues in Higher Education,* May 1, 1987, p. 4.

6 "Battling Bigotry on Campus," p. 60.

7 Wilford Kale, "Bias Foe Says Racism Ingrained at Colleges," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* Jan. 17, 1988, p. 1.

8 Smith College, *The Smith Design for Institutional Diversity,* Smith College, March 1989.

9 See, for example, Lynne Duke, "'Quota': a Word of Many Definitions; Courts Provide Little Guidance as Democrats, White House Clash," *Washington Post,* June 5, 1991, p. A-9. Citing definitions offered by several sources, Duke concludes, "For all the political and racial heat that quotas—real or perceived—have generated, there is no universal definition of the term."

know how much money you would like to have, and then they will work on that goal. I think of a goal also as a spur making you self-conscious about having to achieve a goal. If you just say, "Yes, we want to increase our minority hiring," but you have no goal in mind, it's very hard to get that prod in there, to get the feeling that you've got to accomplish something, to get the will behind it.

Where there have been surprisingly good results in the development of curriculum, Dunn observed that students have generally asked for a required course on diversity. However, since there are "very few campuswide requirements," the creation of a required course would not be popular. "So instead we created a pool of money which faculty would apply to in order to develop new courses which they thought would increase understanding and change the way we look at some things," she said.

For example, the music department used a grant for the faculty to learn more about ethnomusicology in order to be able to transmit that in their introductory freshman courses. The art department tapped the pool to change the character of their vast 100 art course which had traditionally been an introduction to western art and was now coming closer to becoming an introduction to major art styles from other parts of the world. Dunn pointed out that the psychology department developed an upper level course attended by the faculty to which minority experts were brought in who were investigating psychological issues having to do with differences.

Dunn mentioned that the Equity Institute, a consultant firm, led seminars on multiculturalism for people on campus, and in turn, a group of them "felt able to go on to teach similar seminars on campus." The college's affirmative action office offered civil rights seminars that have been successful as well. And in honor of the college's first African American graduate, the first Otelia Cromwell Day was scheduled and devoted to an educational program having to do with diversity. The third such day was soon to take place.

Admitting to some failures along the way, Dunn stated that there remained goals yet to be met. In terms of student recruitment, she said that the new freshman class has met the percentage goal:

in gross numbers. We are not yet there really in the balance amongst the several racial groups that we would like to have . . . [but] I would like to hope that we are going to get that appropriate balance, too. And we are nearly at our first goal in faculty hiring, too. Hiring staff has been a little harder because we have a very low rate of turnover.

Calabia noted that on the day of the interview the *New York Times* carried a story on the controversy over "political correctness" on college campuses,[10] and that 2 weeks earlier, the *Boston Globe*[11] had published a story on campus tensions throughout Massachusetts. He further noted that the week before the factfinding meeting, the *Washington Post* interviewed the U.S. Secretary of Education who appeared to question whether diversity is a sign of educational quality or is a threat to academic freedoms and specialized schools, besides leading to racial quotas.[12] Calabia asked Dunn for her opinion on whether diversity is an indicator of educational quality.

Dunn replied that:

To some extent, yes, it is. I think you have to look at that in several different ways. Diversity is a sign of the quality of national education levels to begin with. We are now a country made up of different racial groups and we are going to become a country which is even more made up of different racial groups, and groups which are very self-conscious about their own past and which have not participated in higher education at the same rate the majority of Americans have. The quality of the Nation, therefore, in educational terms is going to depend on the extent to which we manage to increase access. . . .

I think that is an exceedingly important national goal. If we do not meet that national goal in 20 years time, we are going to regret it a whole lot. . . . So that's one way of defining educational equality—the extent to which the people of the Nation participate in the educational process.

---

10 Anthony DePalma, "In Campus Debate on New Orthodoxy, a Counteroffensive," *New York Times*, Sept. 25, 1991, p. A-1.

11 ". . . Offenses Continue."

12 Kenneth J. Cooper, "Campus Diversity: Is Education Department Interfering on Standards?", *Washington Post*, Sept. 17, 1991, p. 17. See also Karen DeWitt, "Official Assails College Diversity Rule," *New York Times*, Nov. 22, 1991.

Another thing which has very much to do with education is also related to the multicultural quality of our United States population. . . . We have to engender some understanding of those different pasts. . . [and] maintain a powerful understanding of the western tradition, which has been the basic substratum of American development. And it is people who concentrate on maintaining the western tradition to the exclusion of all else with whom I would have an argument. So I think, yes, diversity has a lot to do with educational quality.

Diversity is improving at Smith College, said Dunn, though more needs to be done to increase the percentages of some individual minority groups. She admitted, too, that, "We still see racist incidents on campus. . . [and] many of our minority students still feel insulted from time to time. . . . Racism is such a persistent and deep problem in the United States that I don't think any American campus can rid itself completely of this terrible thing." She considered the stiffest obstacles still to be overcome as those:

encounters in residential life where students of many kinds live together in very close quarters and where the socialization of a given student in her family, in the town she comes from, has not given her a natural way of dealing with people who are different. . . . Some of our toughest problems emerge in those close situations in the houses.

Almost all of the students—be they Asian Americans, African Americans, Caucasian Americans, and others—arrive on campus having only lived with their own kind. When they previously had been confronted by differences, it usually happened in "the most normal structured kind of setting, perhaps in a classroom." But on campus they actually have to live with differences, and "it is that living together that I think presents the hardest challenges for young people." Dunn added that:

sometimes I would like to think that when there is a racist incident in a house, for example, a frightful anonymous letter or something like that, the very openness and explosive quality of the discussion that follows is educational, and education is, after all, what we are about.

Psychology Department

Dr. Fletcher Blanchard, of Smith College's Psychology Department, said he was invited to participate in the factfinding meeting to describe some of the research he had been doing.[13] He emphasized that "what you say, what I say, what we say about racial discrimination and interracial acceptance matters. Your voiced opinions affect what others think and say." A series of experiments conducted by his colleagues and students has demonstrated that "racial prejudice and reactions to racism are much more malleable than many of the researchers and policymakers and political leaders have believed." Hearing others condemn or condone racism dramatically affects a person's own reactions to racism.[14]

Blanchard pointed out that after hearing someone condemn racism, the college students who were participants in his research "much more strongly condemned incidents of harassment than if they had heard no one." In contrast, after hearing someone condone discrimination and harassment, the research subjects would also express "significantly more condoning opinions." The large differences appear among research participants who speak their views publicly and openly and also when their opinions are measured with more anonymity. "The observation that even more privately held views are affected by what others say is important because it suggests that the malleability we have observed is not simply a reflection of concerns for what others think." In a *New York Times* article describing Blanchard's research, Blanchard is also quoted as concluding that, "the research makes it clear that . . . a school should have an aggressive policy against racist acts." The article further reports that partly upon Blanchard's encouragement, "Smith College has

---

13 See Daniel Goleman, "New Way to Battle Bias. Fight Acts, Not Feelings; Condemning Racism Will Discourage Bias Incidents, Study Finds," *New York Times*, July 16, 1991, (hereafter cited as "New Way to Battle Bias. . . ."), pp. C-1-C-8. See also "Testimony Offered Before the Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights," app. C.

14 See also Blanchard, F.A., Lilly, T., and Vaughn, L.A., "Reducing the Expression of Racial Prejudice," *Psychological Science*, American Psychological Society, March 1991, pp. 101-05.

adopted a plan for countering racism; it includes having every new faculty member, student and staff person go through a workshop designed to make clear that acts of prejudices will not be tolerated."[15]

Blanchard speculated that "one of the reasons that the opinions about racism held by many people today are so easily influenced derives from the still very high level of racial segregation that characterizes contemporary American society." He noted that few white college students enjoyed the opportunity of growing up in integrated neighborhoods, attending substantially integrated schools, or observing their parents interact in "a friendly manner with people of color." Even fewer white students entering college today have a chance to learn from black teachers, participate in voluntary activities in organizations headed by black advisers or coaches, or work for black employers. He further observed that, although public opinion poll data over the last several decades portray favorable trends in the attitudes of whites towards African Americans, those attitudes and opinions derive from little direct experience. He added:

> Few of the many whites, I would argue, who have reached honest and genuine commitments to egalitarian values have had the opportunity to acquire the full range of interpersonal skills, sensibilities, and knowledge that might allow them to fulfill that commitment. It is this lack of interracial experience that may underlie the malleability of reaction to racism.

Blanchard further observed that today's American campuses constitute the first multiracial social setting encountered by many young people. However, as the racial and ethnic composition of American campuses continued to become even more heterogenous over the last two decades, there has been an alarming increase in racial harassment. Still, the strongly positive trend towards a more favorable racial attitude among Americans makes it difficult to attribute this high rate of racist attacks on college campuses to an increase in racial prejudice among the many.

Instead, Blanchard suggested that "much of the current incidence should be understood to represent the open hostility expressed by the strongly prejudiced few." Efforts to reduce racial harassment and discrimination and to enhance "feelings of acceptance and belonging among people of color must acknowledge the many who are naive, inexperienced and often well-intentioned, on the one hand, and the few who are genuinely mean-spirited on the other." He said that campuses have mainly responded with education and training for students and staff and with new codes that attempt to define appropriate conduct. Neither of these strategies has yet produced the ideal educational setting where all members of the academic community can thrive.

Thus, Blanchard's recommendation would involve developing campus civil rights policies by borrowing from Federal and State civil rights statutes and integrating them into a statement of the institution's academic mission. The policies would be used to regulate the behavior of the relatively few bigots, but "mere punishment for isolated, unintentional mistakes and insensitivities offers little guidance for the honestly well-intentioned, yet inexperienced." Blanchard believed that the possibility of punishment for acts of insensitivity may deter interaction among the well intentioned of different races. "For fear of doing the wrong thing, the inexperienced sometimes choose to avoid situations where their naivete may be observed by others." His recommendation for dealing with them would be to use praise to reward behavior evidencing favorable interracial behavior, although Blanchard acknowledged that interracial kindness and respect is more difficult to notice than the opposite behavior demonstrated by bigots.

At the same time, Blanchard did not dismiss "the many unintentional yet hurtful acts" done by the inexperienced. The fact of being so numerically underrepresented even among well-intentioned whites makes it possible to magnify the discomfort felt by a minority member due to an insensitive act. Moreover, while an individual white person may only infrequently commit an insensitive act, it is possible for the many well-intentioned whites to accumulate so many of such acts among them that the discomfort felt by the minority person can be magnified. Blanchard hypothesized that if a black were to be just 1 person in a unit of 10 persons—

---

15 "New Ways to Battle Bias. . . .," p. C-8.

all the other 9 being well-intentioned but inexperienced whites—and if each white were to commit only one act of insensitivity per month, it is still possible for the black person to experience an insensitive act at the rate of about one every third day.

Blanchard closed by offering two metaphors that describe a setting closer to the ideal educational setting. The first referred to how antismoking norms and regulations largely achieved the elimination of tobacco smoke from public places.

> When a broad consensus was reached that persons have a right to breathe air untainted by cigarette smoke, when nonsmokers took the responsibility for criticizing smokers and insisted that they not smoke, cigarette smoke in public places disappeared. No one cared about the personal feelings, the internal attitudes or the out-of-context behavior of smokers. . . . We focused on the outward behavior, not the intentions or the inside feelings. If we can build a consensus that eschews the behavior of bigotry, we may be able to create settings that are free of such bigotry.

His second metaphor dealt with the social movement against drinking and driving and how that movement transformed the general view of personal responsibility for behavior influenced by intoxication. He observed that drunkenness used to serve to deflect blame and reduce responsibility for behavior; drunkenness was akin to diminished capacity.

> Persons who performed what otherwise constitutes serious criminal behavior were held less responsible for the outcomes of their acts because we thought they did not intend those outcomes. We now hold persons responsible for the outcomes of their behavior. If we can build a consensus that recognizes that even unintended discrimination is terribly hurtful and harmful and that each of us is personally responsible for our unintended racism, we may be able to create educational settings that are as welcoming and comfortable for people of color as they have been for centuries for others.

Smith College Campus Security Department

Sharon Rust introduced herself as the chief of the Campus Security Department of Smith College where she has served for approximately 14 years. Prior to her arriving at Smith College there were racial harassment incidents, and she stated that cases of racism and harassment have continued to be reported. When Rust gives an orientation speech to college residents and various groups, she tells her audience to "report any incident, no matter how minor, how small it may seem, because many times . . . it is indicative of a larger problem."

During her years at Smith College, Rust has noticed an increase in the reporting of incidents, but she said that she was unsure as to what to attribute the increase to, "whether our system has become more in place and . . . students know what avenues to choose, or, I would like to think that there is a greater sensitivity to these issues." She explained that such reports go first to the office of affirmative action. In fact, many recent cases were reported directly to that office instead of being reported to her department. Whenever that occurred, the affirmative action office requested assistance on investigative procedures from her department. Once an investigation begins, her department's role is to provide services for the gathering and analysis of evidence and for further consultation with the district attorney's office to ascertain possible charges and to assist with the investigation.

She observed that the factfinding meeting panelists have eloquently argued that the key to solving the problems of incidents on campus is through education, and she believed in the need for such education for her police officers and for the students, administration, and staff. She noted that she knew many of the Smith College student panelists at the factfinding meeting, having:

> dealt with them on incidences involving racism, or notes, anonymous notes. In one way or another, it becomes a very personal issue, a very explosive issue, and an issue that is difficult for everyone to try to resolve to everyone's satisfaction. That does not come easily.

4. Public Law Enforcement and Legal Panel

Massachusetts State Police

Lieutenant Edward D. Harrington, of the Massachusetts State Police, stated that he was assigned to the district attorney's office for Hampshire and Franklin Counties where he has worked closely with local law enforcement personnel serving communities including UMASS and Smith College. He recommended that college students be informed of the statutes available to them regarding the criminal aspects of civil rights violations, since "it is extremely important that students know that racial harassment or violence is a crime in and of itself." He also urged that a series of reporting mechanisms be set up so that all appropriate law enforcement personnel receive prompt notification.

He said that if the reporting is done in a timely manner, the information can be gathered and the investigation can be carried out properly.

> We're not saying that we are going to solve every case or that every case is going to go into the courts system. But we will say that we will give serious consideration, serious time, serious commitment, serious manpower to every situation that we become aware of throughout the campuses.

The local district attorney has established a policy that his office is to be notified if any civil rights case is going to undergo criminal investigations. The district attorney then comes to his State police office to request assistance in the investigation or to ask the State police to monitor the local police department involved. He viewed the district attorney as being "very adamant that [incidents] be investigated properly and, if the information calls for it, that [incidents] be prosecuted."

District Attorney's Office for Northwestern District

Winston Burt, an assistant district attorney serving the northwestern district, explained that Judd J. Carhart, the district attorney, had been present earlier but could not remain. Burt stated that the district attorney's office is responsible for prosecuting crimes and criminal behavior, and that the office seems to be prosecuting more crimes of a civil rights nature than ever. Most fall under the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act (CRA), which Burt summarized by saying that, "if anyone threatens or oppresses or interferes with anyone else in the free exercise of any rights that they have—any civil rights—and, if it is done willfully and with force or the threat of force, that is a crime. It is a misdemeanor, and it is punishable by up to a year in jail and up to a $1,000 fine. If bodily injury results from the incident, it becomes a felony with up to 10 years in prison and up to a $10,000 fine."[1]

Burt noted that the CRA had already been characterized during the factfinding meeting as a relatively new, complicated statute. He agreed with the characterization and reported that, nonetheless, the CRA is being increasingly invoked. He stated that "I can only underscore what has already been said many, many times here today, and that is that there is a tremendous need for the education of everyone with respect to what that statute is and what can be done with it." The clarification and healthy growth of the CRA over the years will depend upon its appropriate prosecution, and that depends upon the reporting of incidents when they happen and on the cooperation and continued participation of victims and witnesses in prosecution.

At the same time, he pointed out that in Massachusetts there are several other criminal statutes that can be applied against bias-motivated incidents. One is another section of the same chapter containing the CRA which makes it a crime to assault or to commit assault and battery against someone for the purpose of intimidating them on the basis of race, religion, or national origin.[2] A different statute prohibits the defacing or destruc-

1 Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 265 § 37 (West 1990).

tion of a place of religious worship,[3] and another makes it a crime to discriminate against anyone in a place of public accommodation.[4]

Dr. Samuel B. Hand, the Chairperson of the Vermont Advisory Committee, asked how juries have reacted to cases brought under the CRA. Burt responded that he had not yet had any that had gone to a jury verdict up to the date of the factfinding meeting. Consequently, he could not speculate as to whether juries would be more willing to convict for bias-motivated crimes or less willing. On the other hand, he believed that judges might prove to be a problem, and he reported that he had had some experience with one or two judges at the district court level "who have not found incidents to be civil rights violations that I strongly felt were civil rights violations." Meanwhile, the police have shown themselves to be cooperative, and the various police departments are learning more about the CRA as time passes.

Of course, not every civil rights violation is a crime, said Burt, and "a certain amount of screening has to go into these things that have been reported to us. But . . . it is a priority of this district attorney's office to prosecute these crimes when they do come in, and we do that."

Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law

Ozell Hudson, Jr., the executive director of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law of the Boston Bar Association, mentioned that he was a product of affirmative action as a university student in Georgia who had come out of a segregated public school system in Chatham County, Georgia, having been born in Jeff Davis County of the same State. He added that he had once served as an attorney for students of the UMASS/Amherst campus. He explained that the national office of the Lawyers Committee was founded in 1963, and that the Boston Lawyers Committee began functioning in 1968 "as a pro bono civil rights organization," and over the last 20 years the latter has focused on race and national origin discrimination.

In terms of education, the Lawyers Committee filed the 1974 Boston school desegregation case and at the time of the factfinding meeting had a lawsuit pending against the Commonwealth of Massachusetts dealing with equity in school funding. As part of its 10-year-old project to combat racial violence, the Lawyers Committee has gone into schools and colleges to work with administrators and students regarding issues of bias-motivated violence. On the topic of the factfinding meeting, Hudson said that "one of our biggest problems has been to educate people in the law enforcement community about the importance of racial violence and hate crimes. . . and that they need to make the appropriate response."

He noted that the Lawyers Committee is also urging that in some jurisdictions and on some college campuses "there needs to be an external review over law enforcement." He recalled that several years earlier at UMASS, he represented a coalition of women students, and "we actually had to more or less lead a protest at the district attorney's office to get him to hold an inquest" into the cause of death of a young black UMASS female student. On the other hand, Hudson stressed that there are limitations and that:

> the Federal Government does not have jurisdiction in these cases most of the time unless there is some type of a conspiracy to deprive people of their constitutional rights or rights guaranteed and protected under Federal law, or there actually has to be some physical abuse by a person acting under the cloak of officialdom, under color of law. In most instances, you really can't even get the FBI to investigate. There are also limitations on the State under existing State criminal laws. [Some] just do not reach these acts of racial violence and hate crimes, and so we have to look and continue to try to create certain standards.

---

2 Mass. Gen. L. Ann. ch. 265 § 39 (West 1990).

3 Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 266 § 127A (West 1990).

4 Mass. Gen. L. Ann. ch. 272 § 98 (West 1970).

Hudson also commented on the debate "about how far the university can go in regulating hate crimes or racial violence, and the debate is based upon the first amendment right." He suggested that people recognize that:

> what we all have in common is that we are all human beings. Now, the one reason we need civil rights legislation and laws to protect people from hate crimes is that everyone is not recognized as a human being, and I specifically say that for African Americans. . . . The institutions in this country that control the perceptions and the distribution of information and the education of folks still perceive of African Americans and other [nonwhite] persons to be inhuman, to be nonhuman, and that allows the majority to go forward and continue to discriminate and to dehumanize and to attack and to victimize people simply because of the color of their skin.

For this reason, Hudson thought it "imperative that universities and colleges develop certain standards in [drawing up guidelines] against certain conduct, and this conduct can include speech." While it would be unlawful to prohibit pure speech, the Supreme Court has "not prohibited the State from enacting laws to regulate speech that is combined with conduct, especially conduct that is injurious, that amounts to racial violence or hate crimes that can be regulated, and does not violate the first amendment."

He closed by emphasizing that there not only need to be regulations and standards but also people committed to eradicating hate crimes and to taking the steps necessary to see that such laws, once enacted, are enforced and that the administrators do their job. On the policy side, if a university receiving Federal funds allows hate crimes and racial violence to occur on its campus, the Federal Government should cut off its funding, said Hudson.

5. Summary and Recommendations of Speakers

In Amherst, Massachusetts, representatives of the State Advisory Committees serving Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut heard almost three dozen speakers discuss campus tensions stemming from incidents based on racial or religious ignorance and bigotry. Several speakers also addressed ways of overcoming bias-related problems on campuses. The off-campus specialists were from agencies ranging from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Others not based on any college campus came from the Massachusetts Department of Education, the New England Board of Higher Education, a district attorney's office serving two counties, the Massachusetts State Police, and the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

Among the campus-based panelists were 21 students, administrators, faculty, and staff from UMASS/Amherst and Smith College. The day opened with a look at how younger students may react to racial and cultural diversity in primary and secondary schools, and closed with a description of the efforts launched by the New England Board of Higher Education to introduce more minorities into the student populations and faculties of colleges throughout New England.

All speakers either generally agreed that overt "hate incidents," such as bias-motivated graffiti or physical assault, occur or assumed that they occur. At least two said that incidents have increased around the Nation in recent years, with the representative of the international campus security board characterizing the increase as "gigantic." A third said that reports have increased at her campus, though she was unsure as to whether the change resulted from an increase in incidents or improvements in the reporting system. From a different campus, a fourth speaker speculated that probably not all incidents are being reported. The UMASS executive director for public safety bluntly declared that, "racism still flourishes on this campus," while a Smith College junior asserted that, in her whole life she had "never experienced as much racism as I have at Smith College."

An off-campus specialist and one on-campus specialist sketched profiles of typical perpetrators of overt hate incidents affecting colleges. The ADL representative described such perpetrators as "generally white males between the ages of 16 and 24," many of whom seem not to know any blacks or Jews personally. The director of the UMASS office of human relations said that the perpetrator is usually "a white male who has been drinking or drunk—a first year student, perhaps a second year student, . . . accompanied by younger brothers or high school friends from home. Or the perpetrator is the high school friend." Two students charged that students of color have also been singled out and brusquely treated by local police, while the UMASS public safety head added that recruits to the police academy are frequently 18-year-old males who are issued a weapon and trained to look out for the enemy from a military point of view.

In citing the causes of less overt incidents, several noted that perpetrators often act without malice and from ignorance of cultural differences, especially in cases in which minority students reported being offended by curious classmates or other persons they encounter on campus. One UMASS faculty department head observed that students, faculty, and staff come onto campus carrying with them "all of the prejudices and narrow-mindedness that exist in the larger society." The Smith College president spoke of the "socialization of a given student in her family, in the town she comes from" which may not have prepared the student to deal with people who are different, adding that, "almost all of the students—be they [minority or majority students]—arrive on campus having only lived with their own kind." A Smith College professor pointed out that the American campus of today is often the first multiracial social setting encountered by many students, and their observations of how others treat or react to discrimination affect their own views.

As to measures taken to combat campus bias, the acting provost at UMASS/Amherst pointed to the creation of a commission of students, faculty, and staff to advise the university's administrators; the development of a general education curriculum

requiring all students to take two social and cultural diversity courses; the increase of cocurricular programs on race and religion for faculty, students, and staff; and the establishment of an office of human relations. The Smith College president noted the development and implementation of the Smith College Design for Institutional Diversity dealing with student admissions, the recruitment and hiring of minority faculty and staff, and curriculum improvements.

At least two UMASS/Amherst faculty members acknowledged positive changes on campus over two decades, but admitted that problems persist. Several believed that problems will be exacerbated by the drop in Federal and State funding to schools. The Smith College president voiced the opinion that racism is so pervasive in America that it is possible that no campus will be able to rid itself of racism entirely. One of the two UMASS professors went so far as to say that the problem "may ultimately not be amenable to solutions" because of the tendency among different groups in America to experience "abrasion" between one group and another. Such abrasions may not be so significant in a landscape as geographically expansive as the United States, but "on a university campus, you are jammed together [so that abrasion] is going to constantly arise."

Several students from both campuses noted that the creation of distinct cultural centers has been helpful, but at least one on each campus charged that the competition for scarce resources has led administrators to pit one minority center against another. Two students discussed either working for the admissions office or being impressed by recruitment materials; the admissions worker said that minority recruitment seemed underfunded, and the second student claimed to have been misled by recruitment materials into believing there would be larger communities of students of color. A different student complained that, once recruited, each minority student is left to the mercy of an economy of scarcity without the funds to continue his or her studies.

A student from each campus decried the hours spent in frustrating negotiations with administrators over their grievances and demands. A Jewish student said that when the first day-long workshop on the experiences of minorities was organized on her campus, Jewish students and professors found that they were omitted. Upon advocating for inclusion, they were told that anti-Semitism was not considered a form of racism.

The UMASS human relations director, who said that he maintained a scorecard on the administration's responses to students' demands for change, reported that the administration had met 90 percent of the students' demands, but not the critical demands. The chairperson of the UMASS/Amherst Afro-American studies department, who had taught on campus for over two decades, stated that "the university and all of our best efforts alone will not suffice to solve the problem;" confessing that she did not know how to solve it, she nevertheless urged that all continually try. A UMASS/Amherst associate dean of students asserted that the university, like the Nation, is "either unwilling or unable to face the issue of race or racism." He observed that when a racial incident occurs, the issue becomes diluted because the concerns of other groups are added, and "when we always group all of our issues together, we never seem to focus on the issue of race."

Despite many reminders of persistent shortcomings—even failures—in past and current attempts to stem racial and religious bigotry on campus, several speakers did voice recommendations. The attorney from ADL called for joint action projects involving groups in conflict; dialogue is necessary but not enough. After the 1986 World Series, she and others urged dialogue and hotlines, but those alone did not prove productive or lasting. The representative of the international campus security board said that police officers need improved training, and the UMASS public safety head proposed that college training be required of all police applicants and that collective-bargaining contracts be negotiated to permit removal of an officer if cause can be shown.

UMASS/Amherst and Smith College students urged that more minority students and faculty be recruited to their campuses, and one asked that each professor notice whether students of color are enrolled in his or her class and, if not, consider how to become more inclusive. A UMASS student believed that, "modifying the university's perspective on the core curriculum may be the most important change needed." He argued that African American studies, Asian American studies, and the like stand on the periphery of the core curriculum, and what now requires modification are the standard courses on philosophy, literature, his-

tory, and the like. A Smith College student urged that campuses recognize the rights and needs of religious minorities.

The UMASS legal studies professor observed that the first amendment defines and protects the nature of the university for the existence of the university depends upon the first amendment freedoms to inquire and to teach; harassment and intimidation deprive victims of their right to enjoy such freedoms. Therefore, the university must find a way to secure for all the right to these freedoms by making it possible to sanction expressions of racial and religious harassment which prevent victims from enjoying their rights.

In the meanwhile, the UMASS human relations director and the State police representative separately recommended that students be informed of the civil rights statutes already available to protect them and instructed in how to apply them. The former also said that the Federal Government should publish guidelines on how to combat racial and religious harassment in the same way that the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued guidelines precluding sexual harassment in the workplace.

A Smith College professor noted that the campaigns to limit public smoking and drinking and driving resulted in focusing on the behavior of people and not their attitudes or whether they are responsible for their actions. Once a consensus developed that people have a "right to breathe air untainted by cigarette smoke," people insisted that smoking in public places be limited regardless of how smokers felt about the matter. In terms of alcohol, drinkers once were considered less responsible for what occurred while they were intoxicated; however, today's consensus holds that drinkers should be held responsible for the outcomes of their behavior. The Smith College professor suggested that in like fashion a consensus should be achieved which recognizes that "even unintended discrimination is terribly hurtful and harmful. . . ." By doing so, it may become possible to create bias-free educational settings.

6. Findings and Recommendations

Based on the foregoing, the Massachusetts Advisory Committee offers the following findings and recommendations:

1. Finding

By all accounts, bias-related incidents continue to occur at UMASS and Smith College and reportedly on other campuses. Such incidents are of at least two kinds: 1) overt incidents motivated by racial or religious prejudice and sometimes involving physical assault; and 2) covert incidents involving persons acting or speaking out of ignorance of the cultural, religious, or ethnic background of the individual offended.

Recommendation

Campus authorities should continue to encourage victims to report overt incidents and should tabulate all such reports and continue to help students and others to understand the effects of both overt discrimination and covert discrimination.

2. Finding

Top administrators at UMASS and Smith College are aware of the problems associated with bias-related incidents and have taken specific steps to combat the problems, but many minority students, some faculty, and even a few administrators view those steps as insufficient or ineffective.

Recommendation

Top administrators should be encouraged to continue their efforts and be given additional assistance by all levels of government to strengthen and, where appropriate, to diversify those efforts.

3. Finding

Religious minorities have found themselves omitted from some campus efforts intended to reduce ignorance or tensions associated with bias-related incidents.

Recommendation

Religious minorities should be accorded equal treatment when campus efforts are made to reduce ignorance or tensions resulting from bias-related incidents.

4. Finding

Covert bias-motivated incidents tend to be committed by white males in their teens or early twenties, many of whom may have grown up in communities in which there is little or no social interaction among different racial or religious groups. That incidents of bigotry have been reported at a prestigious women's college indicates that females of college age may engage in covert incidents as well.

Recommendation

The importance of encouraging multicultural education and interaction before a student's college years should be increasingly emphasized at the elementary school level or no later than the secondary school level. Any multicultural education still required at the college level should be recognized as important remedial work—as necessary as remedial English or remedial math is for many students.

5. Finding

Campuses have instituted multicultural courses as part of campaigns to reduce bigotry and ignorance by increasing awareness. At UMASS two such courses are mandatory. But standard courses that are components of the core curriculum are considered by some minority students as bereft of multicultural viewpoints.

Recommendation

Where the core curriculum has already been modified to reflect a multicultural awareness, a periodic review of the curriculum should be done and improvements made, as necessary. Where no changes in the core curriculum or its component courses have taken place, a review should be started and modifications begun to be

made. In either case, student representatives should be invited to engage in the review process.

6. Finding

Campuses have established cultural centers to provide minority students with a setting for mutual support where they can also share their unique interests. However, the scarcity of resources to maintain such centers has sometimes led to conflicts among different groups of minority students and with administrators over how available resources have been allocated.

Recommendation

Campus administrators should involve students in the process of periodically reviewing what the resources are and how they can be best allocated or reallocated and where additional resources should be sought.

7. Finding

Students of different racial or religious backgrounds have often come into conflict with each other, and such conflicts sometimes occur between two different minority communities.

Recommendation

As a way to improve relations between majority and minority groups or between different minority groups, structured events aimed at dialogue between the conflicting groups should be seen as only an initial or minimal step. The conflicting groups should also be encouraged to design and launch joint projects for closer, positive interaction and more lasting results.

8. Finding

The undergraduate's life cycle on campus is around 4 years, and any knowledge or hard-won experience gained by a student during that time is often lost to the campus upon the student's graduation; new undergraduates then arrive with the potential for repeating problems of bigotry and racial or religious misunderstanding.

Recommendation

Campus personnel and students alike should be encouraged to devise ways of preserving on campus the heritage of any positive experiences so that those experiences are not lost to new students. Where possible, minority alumni—both recent and from earlier decades—should be encouraged to contribute to the continuing process of evaluation and reflection aimed at reducing bigotry and racial or religious misunderstanding at their alma mater.

9. Finding

The recruitment of minority students and faculty is inadequate or uneven and has been further hurt by limitations on scholarships or financial aid for needy minority students.

Recommendation

The Federal Government should announce unambiguous support for minority scholarships and other aid intended to enable needy minority students to afford college and should also offer them scholarship incentives to embark upon graduate work in preparation for college-level teaching.

10. Finding

Students and other campus personnel may be no more aware of the civil rights statutes intended to protect them than are any other residents of Massachusetts.

Recommendation

Concerted efforts by the enforcement offices of the Federal, State, and local governments should be made to apprise all on campus, and particularly students, of the various statutes enacted to combat bias-related incidents. Special attention should be given to the application of the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act.

11. Finding

Police personnel are not fully trained to deal with problems associated with racial and religious bigotry and may even contribute to the problems by brusque, if not, improper treatment of students of color.

Recommendation

The kind of multicultural education needed on campus should be tailored to the needs of police departments both on- and off-campus.

12. Finding

The monitoring of efforts to safeguard the civil rights of minority college students is uneven or ad hoc at best despite the number of public and private agencies involved in responses to bias-motivated incidents.

Recommendation

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which held a consultation on the subject of campus tensions and issued a report in October 1990, should consider organizing a followup event in 1995, which could assess the status of the problem at the midpoint of the decade. The State Advisory Committees which have held similar events in New England and elsewhere should consider return visits to the colleges they involved around the same time.

Appendix A

1990 College Enrollment by Race

Total	Native American	Asian American	Black	Hispanic	White
United States					
13.7 million	103,000 0.75%*	555,000 4.05%	1,223,000 8.92%	758,000 5.53%	10,675,000 77.86%
UMASS/Amherst					
26,025	0.2%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	85.1%
Smith College					
3,058	0.3%	8.6%	4.1%	3.2%	77.7%
UCONN/Storrs					
25,497	0.4%	3.5%	3.5%	2.9%	86.6%
Wesleyan University					
3,419	0.1%	6.3%	7.2%	3.0%	80.4%
UVM/Burlington					
11,076	0.2%	2.7%	0.8%	1.2%	93.3%
Middlebury College					
2,039	0.0%	4.5%	3.0%	2.7%	87.8%

Source: "College Enrollment by Racial and Ethnic Group," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Mar. 18, 1992, p. A-35.

* Percentages will not total 100 percent because foreign students of all races are omitted.

How to Survive Campus Bigotry

Advice on Coping With Racism—From Grads Who've Been Through It

By Paul Ruffins

UNDER OUTGOING president Derek Bok, Harvard-Radcliffe implemented a sophisticated policy of fostering diversity. Recently my wife and I, both members of the Harvard class of '76, went back to Cambridge and asked black administrators and alumni what advice they would give to black students facing racism on campuses across the country. Here's what they suggested:

■ *Argue historically, not individually.* "Remember the history of how this whole situation came about," advises Marcia Turner, a PhD who is back on campus on an administrative fellowship. Current strategies to increase minority students were developed to rectify a historical situation in which whites reserved many advantages for themselves. In response to the civil rights movement, President Nixon and others developed affirmative action as a just alternative to, for example, financial reparations to blacks.

Paul Ruffins is a Washington journalist. Historical research was provided by Fath Davis Ruffins, who was president of Harvard's black student organization as an undergraduate.

The question "Why is it fair that they chose a black student over a similar white student?" is like the question "Why is it fair that I can't deduct my rent but you can deduct your mortgage interest?" The answer is that public policies that seek to promote certain social goods, like home ownership, or more black college grads, can favor some individuals over others.

■ *Ask the university to explain its entire admissions policy.* David L. Evans, a black senior admissions officer, explains that few, if any, universities simply admit the applicants with the best grades and highest SAT scores. If so, colleges wouldn't require interviews, essays or recommendations. Evans feels that if more white students understood how they were admitted, they might be less resentful. At least at Harvard, white students wildly overestimate the number of black and Asian students on campus. Evans states that "Harvard gets eight qualified applicants for every one we accept, so if we took no black students, there would still be 8,000 who didn't get in and think it was the 100 to 150 black students that kept them out—even though the black students were also presidents of their schools, or captains of the debating team."

He adds, "Ninety percent of all students admitted to Harvard and other fine schools get in for reasons other than academic excellence alone. We could fill the class twice with students with perfect records. However, that means we would never have any athletes, or music majors, or plays on campus. But once they're here you can't tell which students got in because they grew up on a farm. But people think they can see who got in because they're black."

■ *Resist the notion that you are "unqualified."* Don't let anyone presume that all or even most black students have poor academic credentials. Patricia Rhymer-Todman, a PhD in psychology, says, "Nobody who is knowledgeable thinks that SAT's predict anything in the real world except how middle-class students do in the first year of college. When people, like the fellow at Georgetown University, make an issue of the fact that some minority students are admitted with lower scores, they never say whether those differences are statistically significant."

■ *Calibrate your responses to racism.* All racial incidents are not the same and neither should be your response. If someone attacks you publicly, do some research and

engage in debate. In the 1970s, a black Harvard professor named Martin Kilson wrote a widely publicized article charging that black students practiced segregation by always sitting together in cafeterias. In response, a group of black students conducted research that found that while many black students did eat together, most had a wider range of friends and were involved in a greater variety of activities than most white students. This was far more effective than picketing or branding Kilson an Uncle Tom.

■ *Save your indignation for truly important confrontations.* Roberta Morton, now a legal defense lawyer, suggests, "Do your best, don't let racism distract you, and don't come expecting a problem."

■ *Explain the role of colleges and universities.* Many students view college as a "reward" for studying. But a primary role of universities is to meet the educational needs of the society. That's why they receive tax exemptions.

You got into college because you were motivated and because the society understands that it's better off with more black lawyers, doctors and leaders. Moreover, restricted access to education is one reason black communities don't have the human resources they need.

However, if you receive a preference, you also incur a responsibility. Brandon Balthazar, a management consultant, reminds black students, "You don't have to justify yourself to anyone else, but you are obligated to do more than simply look out for yourself."

■ *Celebrate the black heritage in education.* Learn about your black alumni. Fath Davis Ruffins, a historian (and my wife), points out that at Harvard alone, "giving black students a chance produced W.E.B. Du Bois, Charles Hamilton Houston, Alain Locke, Ralph Bunche and others." She also suggests teaching other students about how our struggle has benefited them. For example, black colleges were havens for Holocaust survivors after World War II and for blacklisted scholars during the McCarthy period. The civil rights movement did much to silence conservatives who argued that women were taking spaces from "more qualified" men. And without the student aid bills championed by black congressmen Adam Clayton Powell and Gus Hawkins, many working-class white students could never afford a higher education.

■ *Take a stand on principles that will support you in the long run.* You can never win by advocating censorship or being racist or antisemitic or sexist. Peter Ivan Armstrong, also an administrative fellow, declares, "We cannot be selectively tolerant. As a black southerner I do consider the Confederate flag a symbol of racism and violence. But when a white student hung a Confederate flag out of her window, I supported President Bok's decision to allow her do it."

You don't have to passively accept racist behavior—campuses also value civility and eloquence. "If someone can only engage in free speech by calling you a nigger," Armstrong muses, "you should insist that anyone who calls themselves a college student should be more articulate."

Appendix C

Testimony Offered Before the Massachusetts Advisory Committee
to the United States Commission on Civil Rights

Fletcher A. Blanchard

Smith College

September 27, 1991

What you say about racial discrimination and interracial acceptance matters. Your vocal opinions affect what others think and say. A series of experiments that I and my students and colleagues have conducted recently demonstrate that racial prejudice and reactions to racism are much more malleable than many researchers, policy makers, and political leaders have believed. Simply overhearing others condemn or condone racial harassment dramatically affects people's personal reactions to racism. After hearing someone else condemn racism, our college student research participants expressed much more strongly antiracist sentiments than they did in the absence of a sense of what others believe. However, after hearing someone condone racism, college students voiced much less strongly antiracist views. The large differences that we observed appear both when research participants speak their views publicly and when we measure their opinions more anonymously. The observation that even more privately held views are affected by what others say is important because it suggests that the malleability we have observed is not simply a reflection of concerns for what others think.

I suspect that one of the reasons that the opinions about racism held by many people are so easily influenced derives from the still high level of racial segregation that characterizes contemporary American society. Few White college students today have enjoyed the opportunity to grow up in integrated neighborhoods, attend schools where their own classrooms are substantially integrated, or observe their parents interact in a friendly manner with people of color. Even fewer of those White students entering college today have had the chance to learn from Black teachers, work for Black employers, or participate in voluntary activities and organizations where the adult leaders, coaches, or advisers are Black. Although public opinion poll data over the last several decades portray largely favorable trends regarding Whites' attitudes toward African Americans, those attitudes and opinions derive from little direct experience. Few of the many Whites who have reached an honest commitment to egalitarian values have had the opportunity to acquire the full range of interpersonal skills, sensibilities, and knowledge that might allow them to fulfill that commitment. It is this lack of interracial experience that may underlie the malleability of reactions to racism.

America's campuses today constitute the first multiracial social setting encountered by many young people. Furthermore, the racial and ethnic composition of American campuses will continue to become increasingly heterogeneous over the next two decades. Coinciding with these changes in composition has been an alarming increase in racial harassment. Yet, the strongly favorable trend toward more egalitarian racial attitudes among Americans broadly makes it difficult to attribute this high rate of racist attacks on college campuses to an increase in racial prejudice among the many. Rather, I would suggest that much of the current incidence of harassment should be understood to represent the open hostility expressed by the strongly prejudiced few.

Efforts that will reduce racial harassment and discrimination and enhance feelings of acceptance and belonging among people of color must acknowledge the many who are naive, inexperienced, and often well-intentioned, on the one hand, and the few who are genuinely mean-spirited, on the other. For the most part colleges and universities have responded to the contemporary clamor with education and training for students and staff and with new codes that attempt to define appropriate conduct. Neither of these strategies has yet produced the ideal educational setting where all members of the academic community can thrive.

The best of the codes of conduct signal a strong and public institutional commitment to the protection of civil rights. Often this is achieved by borrowing language from federal and state civil rights statutes and integrating it with a statement of the institution's academic mission. Well drawn policies delineate the responsibilities of all parts of the institution under the policy and concretely specify patterns of accountability. Effective institutional civil rights policies also invite regular, broad review of operating procedures to ensure their compatibility with the institutional commitment to civil rights. I believe that civil rights policies are especially important when it comes to regulating the behavior of the relatively few committed bigots.

Attention to the discriminatory consequences of behavior is required if the institution is to become the sort of educational setting where everyone can thrive. However, mere punishment for isolated, unintentional mistakes and insensitivities offers little guidance for the honestly well-intentioned, yet inexperienced. Rather, the specter of punishment may deter interracial interaction among those who privately suspect they may not measure up. For fear of doing the wrong thing, the inexperienced sometimes choose to avoid situations where their naivete may be observed by others. It is reward, usually in the form of praise, that shapes new behavior. Although it may be more difficult to notice interracial kindness and respect, it is attention to instances of favorable interracial behavior and the delivery of praise following it that will provide the conditions under which the well-intentioned will acquire the skills they currently lack.

But the many unintentional, yet hurtful acts performed by the inexperienced do affect greatly the interracial climate of an organization. That people of color often find themselves numerically underrepresented in academic institutions exaggerates the discomfort and pain that arises out of the infrequent 'insensitivities' performed by any one of the many. Consider an organization in which ten percent of the people are Black and ninety percent are White. Imagine a department of that organization in which ten people work, nine of whom are White and one of whom is Black. Imagine further that all nine of the Whites perceive themselves to be unprejudiced and have adopted a genuine commitment to egalitarian values. If each of those well-intentioned Whites makes only one insensitive 'mistake' a month, the one Black target of the nine naive Whites would experience on average some hurtful behavior every third day. While the personal experience that defines the social reality for the numerically underrepresented person of color consists of a high rate of discriminatory and isolating behaviors directed toward her or him, the personal experiences of the well-intentioned Whites define a social reality relatively free of harassment and discrimination. The well-intentioned White is aware of only one insensitive event over the last month. Reduce the proportion of African Americans or add an intentional racist and the resulting setting becomes even more aversive. This imbalance

in perceptions of the rate of discrimination and insensitivity exacerbates the potential for misunderstanding. Educational strategies are required to reduce the rate of unintentional harm caused by inexperienced people. The best educational techniques emphasize vivid and concrete examples of the hurtful and harmful behavior of the naive.

Let me conclude by returning to the implications of the research I described at the beginning of my remarks and leave you with two metaphors that drive my understanding of the potential for achieving educational settings where everyone can thrive. First, I would like you to think about the way that anti-smoking norms and regulations have largely achieved the elimination of smoke from public places. When a broad consensus was reached that persons have a right to breathe air untainted by cigarette smoke, when non-smokers took the responsibility for criticizing smokers and insisted that they not smoke, cigarette smoke in public places disappeared. No one cared about the personal feelings, internal attitudes, or out-of-context behavior of the smokers. If we can build a consensus that eschews the *behavior* of bigotry, we may be able to create settings that are free of bigotry.

Second, I invite you to think about how the social movement against drinking and driving has transformed our thinking about personal responsibility for behavior performed while intoxicated. It used to be the case that drunkenness served to deflect blame and reduce responsibility for behavior. Drunkenness was akin to diminished capacity. Persons who performed what otherwise constitutes serious criminal behavior were held less responsible for the outcomes of their acts because we thought they didn't intend those outcomes. Of course, this has changed now. We now hold persons responsible for the outcomes of their drunken behavior. If we can build a consensus that recognizes that even unintended discrimination is terribly hurtful and harmful and that each of us is personally responsible for our unintended racism, we may be able to create educational settings that are as welcoming and comfortable for people of color as they have been for centuries for others.